HYMN OF CREATION

(NĀSADIYA SŪKTA, ṚIGVEDA, X, 129)

[नासदीय सूक्त व्याख्या]

3087

VASUDEVA S. AGRAWALA

STATE MUSEUM, LUCKNOW
LIBRARY
Acc. No.
Book No.

891.2

HYMN OF CREATION

(Nāsadīya Sūkta, Ṛigveda, X. 129)

[नासदीय सूक्त व्याख्या]

11.2.66
लखनऊ
3087
11.2.66
State Museum, Library, Lko.

By

VASUDEVA S. AGRAWALA

Professor, College of Indology

Director, School of Vedic Studies

Banaras Hindu University.

1963

Published by
Prithivi Prakashan
D. 8/35 Kalka Gali
Varanasi-1 (INDIA).

Price 10 Shillings; Dollars 2·00

250 Copies

Printed at
The Tara Printing Works, Kamachha, Varanasi.

PREFACE

It is a joy for me to issue this edition of the Nāsadīya Sūkta, Ṛig Veda X. 129. In this Hymn of Creation we have the most sublime philosophical song in the history of the human race.

I am presenting here a fresh study of its contents. In my view its seven mantras present a consistent formulation of the metaphysical doctrine about cosmogony as known to the Vedic seers. Many other hymns of the Ṛigveda present an elaboration of the theories embodied in this Sūkta.

The hymn is planned in three portions as follows :—

I. Mantras 1 and 2. These enumerate the various philosophical doctrines as they prevailed in the time of the Ṛigveda, viz.

(1) *Sad-AsadVāda,* (2) *Rajo-Vāda,*

(3) *Vyoma-Vāda,* (4) *Parāvara-Vāda,*

(5) *Āvaraṇa-Vāda,* (6) *Ambho-Vāda,*

(7) *Amṛita-Mṛityu-Vāda,* (8) *Ahorātra-Vāda,*

I have explained these in a succinct form.

II. Mantras 3, 4, 5. These form the kernel of the author's views about creation. This portion bristles with a bunch of technical terms as *Âbhu, Tuchchhya,*

Salilam, Idam Sarvam, Manas, Kāma, Asat, Sat, Tiraśchīna Raśmi, Adhaḥ, Upari, Retodhāḥ, Mahimānaḥ, Prayati and *Svadhā.* The statement is extremely compact but pregnant with the Sāṅkhya system in its origin or first formulation. For example, *Apraketa Salila* is *Avyakta Prakṛiti*; *Idam Sarvam* is the aggregate of the three *Guṇas* by which the cosmos is produced. *Tamas* refers to the *Avyakta* state of *Prakṛiti* as it existed in its source which was the other *Tamas* or the Transendent Purusha. *Ābhu* corresponds to the principle of *Mahat* or the Universal. *Tuchchhya* signifies the finite or the limited principle of *Ahṅkāra* or individuated mind which is mentioned as *Manas* with its potent seed *Kāma.*

Then the seven original categories, viz. *Mahat, Ahaṅkāra* and *Pañchabhūta* (*Mahadādi Viśeshāntāḥ* of later times) are divided into two major classes namely *Asat,* or the Prāṇic manifestation of *Mahat* and *Ahaṅkāra* and *Sat* or the *Pañcha Tanmātras* with the five *Bhūtas* and the ten senses. The visible cosmos is all *Sat.*

Mantra 5 repeats through various symbols the division of *Sat* and *Asat.* For example, *Upari* relates to *Asat,* i e. to the higher principle of *Prāṇa* or Divine Energy, and *Adhaḥ* to *Sat,* i.e. *Prakṛiti* or Matter. Similarly *Prayati Parastāt* is mentioned as the higher principle and *Svadhā Avastāt* as the inferior principle of Matter. The *Retodhāḥ* Gods are in the higher source and the *Mahimānaḥ* Gods become operative in matter.

Mahimā is the same as *Mahat* or the first category to emanate from *Tamas* or *Avyakta Prakṛiti.*

III. Mantras 6 & 7. These are couched in a special style which is often found in the Ṛigveda, giving the doctrine not as a categorical statement but in the style of *Sampraśna* or Interrogation. The implication, however, is not negative but affirmative, e. g. कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम is not the query of perplexed ignorance, but an affirmation of the unknowable Hiraṇyagarbha, i.e. *Anirukta* Prajāpati whose symbol is '*Ka*'. The same style is found in the two mantras, Mantra 6 in fact refers to the doctrine of the Devas (*Deva-Vidyā*) as the basis of creation. The whole of the Ṛigveda ultimately lends itself into the hands of the Deva School of Philosophy (*Deva-Vāda*), which may be taken to be the ninth doctrine in addition to eight enumerated in the first two mantras.

Mantra 7 refers to the *Adhyaksha* of *Visṛishṭi* whom the Ṛishis knew as Brahman. The statement whether the Creator himself knows the mystery of creation is rooted in the height of intuitional experience. This mantra succinctly and in a covert manner refers to *Brahmavāda*, Doctrine of *Brahma* as the highest basis of Vedic Philosophy from which other points of view originated.

Thus in the seven mantras of this Sūkta we find a complete statement of Vedic metaphysics which is the quint-essence of the Ṛigveda. I have published here a

running commentary of my own on the main ideas of the Sūkta, and then added comments of modern scholars like Keith, Macdonell, Wilson, and Coomaraswamy. I have also given the interpretation of ancient Indian writers, firstly from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, secondly from Sāyaṇa's commentary on this Sūkta in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, and finally his lucid commentary in the Ṛigveda Bhāshya.

The Nāsadīya Sūkta is a blooming lotus comparable to a *Padma-kosha.* The seed of knowledge lies somewhere in its heart. It is saturated with the fragrance of thought that was in the intuition of the Ṛishis. One may repeat the hymn and breathe its aroma even now. The words are merely symbols which explode as thought advances to more subtle sheaths of Truth. 'This hymn is the finest effort of the imagination of the Vedic poet, and nothing else equals it'.

Banaras Hindu University V. S. AGRAWALA

1-6-1963 [गंगावतरण]

CONTENTS

	Preface	i-iv
1.	Text of the Nāsadīya Sūkta	1
2.	Griffith's Translation	2-3
3.	Our commentary	4-27
	Mantra 1	5-12
	Mantra 2	13-18
	Mantra 3	18-20
	Mantra 4	21-23
	Mantra 5	24-26
	Mantra 6-7	27-28
4.	Keith's Comments	28-30
5.	Macdonell's metrical translation	31-32
6.	Macdonell's Comments	33-34
7.	Wilson's translation	35-36
8.	Wilson's Comments	37-39
9.	Exegesis in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa	40-41
10.	Sāyaṇa's commentary of the Sūkta in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa	42-47
11.	Sāyaṇa's Commentary from the Ṛigveda	48-57
12.	Our comments on the views of modern scholars	58-67
13.	Our comments on the older exegetical material	68-72

HYMN OF CREATION

NĀSADĪYA SŪKTA [RV. X. 129]

[नासदीय सूक्त ऋग्वेद १०।१२९]

नासदीय सूक्त

१—७ प्रजापतिः परमेष्ठी । भाववृत्तम् । त्रिष्टुप् ।

नासदासीन्नो सदासीत्तदानीं नासीद्रजो नो व्योमा परो यत् ।
किमावरीवः कुह कस्य शर्मन्नम्भः किमासीद्गहनं गभीरम् ॥१॥
न मृत्युरासीदमृतं न तर्हि न रात्र्या अह्न आसीत्प्रकेतः ।
आनीदवातं स्वधया तदेकं तस्माद्धान्यन्न परः किं चनास ॥२॥
तम आसीत्तमसा गूळ्हमग्रेऽप्रकेतं सलिलं सर्वमा इदम् ।
तुच्छ्येनाभ्वपिहितं यदासीत्तपसस्तन्महिनाजायतैकम् ॥३॥
कामस्तदग्रे समवर्तताधि मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीत् ।
सतो बन्धुमसति निरविन्दन्हृदि प्रतीष्या कवयो मनीषा ॥४॥
तिरश्चीनो विततो रश्मिरेषामधः स्विदासी३ दुपरिस्विदासी३ त् ।
रेतोधा आसन्महिमान आसन्त्स्वधा अवस्तात्प्रयतिः पुरस्तात् ॥५॥
को अद्धा वेद क इह प्र वोचत्कुत आजाता कुत इयं विसृष्टिः ।
अर्वाग्देवा अस्यविसर्जनेनाथा को वेद यत आ बभूव ॥६॥
इयं विसृष्टिर्यत आ बभूव यदि वा दधे यदि वा न ।
यो अस्याध्यक्षः परमे व्योमन्त्सो अङ्ग वेद यदि वा न वेद ॥७॥

GRIFFITH'S TRANSLATION

1. Then was not non-existent nor existent: there was no realm of air, no sky beyond it.

What covered in, and where? and what gave shelter? Was water there, unfathomed depth of water?

2. Death was not then, nor was there aught immortal: no sign was there, the day's and night's divider.

That One Thing, breathless, breathed by its own nature: apart from it was nothing whatsoever.

3. Darkness there was: at first concealed in darkness this All was indiscriminated chaos.

All that existed then was void and formless: by the great power of warmth was born that Unit.

4. Thereafter rose Desire in the beginning, Desire, the primal seed and germ of Spirit.

Sages who searched with their heart's thought discovered the existent's kinship in the non-existent.

5. Transversely was their severing line extended: what was above it then, and what below it?

There were begetters, there were mighty forces, free action here and energy up yonder.

6. Who verily knows and who can here declare it, whence it was born and whence comes this creation?

The Gods are later than this world's production. Who knows then whence it first came into being?

7. He, the first origin of this creation, whether he formed it all or did not form it.

Whose eye controls this world in highest heaven, he verily knows it, or perhaps he knows not.

———

COMMENTARY

Ṛishi of the Sūkta—The Nāsadīya-sūkta is probably the most recondite statement of the metaphysical thought (*Bhāva-vṛittam*) of the Ṛishis employing a number of technical terms which later on were accepted as definitions in the codified systems of Indian philosophy. Its Ṛishi is Parameshṭhī Prajāpati who seems more to be the personification of an idea rather than a historical sage. Prajāpati in the transcendent form is conceived of as Svayambhū and as Parameshṭhī. Svayambhū or the Self-existent stands for the Absolute who is beyond all predication and above the two-fold categories as envisaged in the first two mantras, viz, beyond immortality and death, light and darkness, Prāṇa and Vāyu, Sat and Asat, Para and Apara, etc. Svayambhū as the Father-principle is the latent source of the manifested cosmos. As a pair to him is Prajāpati Parameshṭhī, representing the Mother principle of the manifested world, the plane of the basic duality, essential for the birth of the universe. Rightly therefore Parameshṭhī or the Universal is spoken of as the Seer responsible for the cosmogonic formulation in the hymn.

WORK OF PANDIT OJHA—This hymn contains refereace to a number of doctrines which served as nucleus for the gathering thoughts of the Ṛishis when poetic statements of Sṛishṭi-Vidyā were being attempted in a rich variety of bold linguistic forms. According to Pandit Madhusudan Ojha of Jaipur who was the one scholar to devote adequate attention to this hymn the first two mantras refer to ten different points of view, each of which occurs in different places in the Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. In his book '*Daśavāda-Rahasya*' he has carried out a discussion of these doctrines and I feel indebted to him for light on this sūkta. I have taken his comments and added much material of my own. The following is an exposition of the doctrines under reference.

Mantra I

1. SADASAD-VĀDA—According to this view the cosmos is *Sat* and its preceding cause *Asat*. In Ṛigveda 10.72 the period of cosmic time is said to be two-fold, viz. the life of Devas in a preceding age (*Pūrvya-yuga*) and a subsequent age (*Uttara-yuga*) the formsr known as *Asat* and the latter as *Sat*. The two stand in a related priority and the *Asat* is said to be kin of *Sat* (*Sato bandhum asati niravindan*, RV.X.129.4). Elsewhere in the Ṛigveda both Asat and Sat are said to have existed in the highest Empyrean which was the abode of God and from which Aditi (Universal

Nature) and her son Daksha (presiding genius of cosmic Yajña) were born—

असच्च सच्च परमे व्योमन् दक्षस्य जनमन्नदितेरुपस्थे ।
अग्निर्ह नः प्रथमजा ऋतस्य पूर्व आयुनि वृषभश्च धेनुः ॥

(RV. X. 5. 7)

The clearest interpretation is found in the Śatapatha where Ast is explained as the *Ṛishi*-creation, which is further explained as *Prāṇa-sṛishṭi* i.e. the principle of conciousness which was the primeval essence in the beginning of the cosmos :—

असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्। तदाहुः किं तदसदासीदिति। ऋषयो वाव ते अग्रे असदासीत्। तदाहुः के ते ऋषय इति। प्राणा वा ऋषयः। (ŚB. 6.1.1.1.)

The gross material creation is said to be Sat and the preceding stage of Prāṇa or energy is termed Asat. It would be valid to speak of Brahman as Asat and Pradhāna or Prakṛiti as Sat. The Seer negates here the predication of either Asat or Sat with reference to the preceding ontological entity which is Parātpara Svayambhū.

2. RAJO-VĀDA—It is said here that *Rajas*, the primeval material cause of the universe, also did not have existence in the latent source. The doctrine of *Rajas* is very much amplified in the Ṛigveda. Once it is said that all the Devas or the Prāṇic energies in creation were at rest in the beginning, i.e. sleeping in

the depth of the primeval ocean of energy. When the urge for creation was felt and the simmering waters of the Deep Sea were churned by a tectonic world-creating movement, the Devas or the Giant-Powers of creativity sprang to their feet and began their cosmic dance. This filled the whole space with particles of agitated dust (*Tīvra-reṇu*, X. 72. 6) Their leader was Indra, the great dancer (*Nṛitu*, VIII. 24. 12), Natarāja of later mythology who performs the cosmic *tāṇḍava*. Each universe is a particle of dust or a grain of sand filling the infinite ocean which is the source of creation.

We meet with another conception of *Rajas* in the Ṛigveda. It is said that *Rajas* is the power of black and white colour, the former is *kṛishṇa rajas*, i.e. latent power existing in the source and the latter is *śukla rajas*, the manifest power. The two are balancing each other, moving hand in hand, which we see in the form of Night and Day or as Darkness and Light revolving in a circle as the dynamic pulsating forces of creation—

अहश्च कृष्णमहरर्जुनं च विवर्तेते रजसी वेद्याभिः ।
वैश्वानरो जायमानो न राजावातिरज्ज्योतिषाग्निस्तमांसि ॥

(RV. VI. 9. 1)

The cosmic Fire or energy which has created the Sun and the Vaiśvānara in the individual centre depend for effective activity on the emergence of this two-fold *Rajas* as the basal dichotomy of the cosmos. They

are spoken of as the Pair of Twin Beauties, viz. the dark and white sisters in whose hands the mighty power of all the gods lies secure—

नाना चक्राते यम्या वपूंषि तयोरन्यद्रोचते कृष्णमन्यत् ।
श्यावी च यदरुषी च स्वसारौ महद्देवानामसुरत्वमेकम् ॥

(RV. III. 55. 11)

Vedic Rajas should be understood as typifying the principle of Motion (*Gati*) as against the principle of Rest (*Sthiti*). Rest is equivalent to *Aja*, the Unborn and Rajas the born principle or created cosmos. The former corresponds to Avyaya Purusha and the latter to Akshara Purusha, the former being the support of the latter—

वि यस्तस्तम्भ षळिमा रजांस्यजस्य रूपे किमपि स्विदेकम् ।

(RV. I. 164. 6).

The six-fold *Rajas* referred to here is the same as 'Six Expansive Ones' (षळुर्वीरेकमिद्बृहत्, RV. X. 14. 16; देवीः षळुर्वीरुरु, X.128.5). This is a reference to the six Space or to the Lokas, viz. Bhūḥ, Bhuvaḥ, Svaḥ, directions of Mahaḥ, Janaḥ, Tapaḥ, with Satyam as the seventh corresponding to *Aja*, the unborn Prajāpati.

3. VYOMA-VĀDA—This is a reference to the doctrine of *Vyoma* equivalent to *Ākāśa* or Space as the ultimate substratum of all things which later on became a major plank in the philosophy of the Upanisads. All the creatures have their being in *Ākāśa*. They emanate

from *Akāśa* and find their ultimate rest in *Akāśa*. The RV. also makes frequent mention of *Parama Vyoma* as the source of all manifest Devas and Vāk. That highest *Ākāśa* is immortal and the source of material space (*Bhūtākāśa*). The thousand-syllablled speech (*Sahasrākshara Vāk*, RV. I. 164. 41) belongs to the level of Parama-Vyoma whereas the speech uttered as sound is mortal and belongs to the sphere of differentiated *Ākāśa*. We all know that Śabda or speech is the attribute of *Ākāśa* and both exist on two relative planes, viz. immortal and mortal, i.e. Divine and Material—*Amṛita-Ākāśa* and *Martya-Ākāśa*, *Amṛitā-Vāk* and *Martyā Vāk*, *Parama-Vyoma* and *Vyoma*.

4. PARĀVARA-VĀDA—It has reference to the relative conception of *Para* and *Apara*, Absolute and Relative, Transcendent and Immanent, Higher and Lower, Ūrdhva and Adhaḥ, Eka and Bahudhā etc. This is a basic conception essential for manifestation. The doctrine is elaborated in Asyavāmīya Sūkta (RV. I. 164. 17-19). There are two categories *Parārdha* and *Avarārdha*, also *Parastāt* and *Avastāt*, *Parāk* and *Arvāk*. Indra symbolizes the former and Soma the latter ; both are moving as an inseparable pair under a common mutual stress called *Rajas* or movement

इन्द्रश्च या चक्रथुः सोम तानि धुरा न युक्ता रजसो वहन्ति ।
(RV. I. 164. 19).

5. ĀVARAṆA-VĀDA—In the second line of mantra 1 an important question is asked which has a

material bearing on the basic principles of creation. It is the question about the measure of the cosmos which determines the size or the container of the object to be made. What was the covering, where was it and what gave shelter ? These have reference to the principle of *Pramā* referred to in Ṛigveda (*Kāsīt pramā pratimā*, RV. X. 130.3). For any thing to be created two factors are essential to be determined, viz. size and model. The principle of size determines the centre (*Nābhi*), the diameter and the circumference (*Maṇḍala*). Whatever is created or made is subject to measurement. The cosmos is frequently spoken of as a measuring out, a planned activity on the part of its Creator. It is *Vimāna*, from the root *Mā* to measure. This is here referred to as *Āvaraṇa* and *Śarman*, the latter also meaning shelter or protection. *Śarma* is identified in the Brāhmaṇa literature as *Charma* (शर्म चर्म वा एतत्कृष्णस्य मृगस्यतन्मानुषं शर्म देवत्रा, ŚB. III. 2.1.8), i. e. esoterically speaking *Śarma* is the same as *Charma*. On the plane of Matter we refer to it as *Charma* or skin which covers and shelters the organism and each of its constituent limbs and also every cell ; the same is known, as *Śarma* on the plane of the working of Prāṇa or Devas. There would be no Yajña without this principle of *Śarma* or divine influence and energy becoming operative inside the measured field where that force or power asserts itself. It is stated in the Purāṇas that God *Śiva* put on an elephant skin

(*Gaja-charma*) in the beginning of his cosmic dance. Here the Elephant is the symbol of *Ahaṅkāra*, the Ego which emerges in the womb of the Universal as the centre of individual envelopment. The size of the Universe is a big question in modern science, and so the question of *Virāṭ* in its spatial and temporal extensions engaged the attention of ancient thinkers and they have striven to formulate their answers in words, but speech, howsoever articulate, falls short of precise definition when it has to grapple with the transcendent categories of Svayambhū Purusha and Virāj Purusha. The Mother-principle is truly the mould or shelter of all created forms and her womb (*Yoni*) is the measure of the manifested forms. The Earth is the symbol of the Mother and it is conceived of as the great receptcle or container (*bhūmir āvapanaṁ mahat*, VS. 23.10). Anything and everything in material manifestation has its Mother. The earth before us of whatever size is the symbol of motherhood and each star including the sun has its mother so that ultimately the whole cosmos existed in the womb of its mother, symbolically thought of as Night (*jagato niveśanī*, RV. I. 35.1), Darkness or the Great Goddess (*Mahā Devī*, *Mahā Rātri*, *Mahā Māyā*).

6. AMBHO-VĀDA:—This was also the basic creed of Vedic poets to think of the cosmic source or mother in terms of the unfathomed waters which are referred to variously as *Āpaḥ*, *Salilam*, *Samudra*, *Soma*,

Ṛita, *Arṇava*, etc. in the Ṛigveda. Those waters as the primeval ocean or the divine mother concealed in their womb millions and billions of fiery sparks which have now become visible to us as so many Suns. The process of creation on the plane of the Universal is continuous going on without stopping and should not be thought of as a historical event in time. Whatever happened in creation in the beginning is happening also today. The horoscope of the cosmos is unfolding incessantly and the powerful strides of Time are moving in endless circles. The infinite ocean as the source was wrapped in stillness but got agitated somewhere and by someone into culvunsions which do not seem to stop anywhere. This has been graphically conceived as a mightly dance movement of the Gods or of the Yatis, i. e. a two-fold movement implying a pull towards the centre (*Pravritti*) and a corresponding movement turning away from the centre (*Nivṛitti*). Both are essential for the dance, viz. the stable axis and the moving felly. The Deva stands for Yajña, order, system or stability, whereas the Yati or Muni for the opposite principle of erratic motion. They coexist and are essential for creation

मुनिर्देवस्यदेवस्य सौकृत्याय सखा हितः,

(RV. X. 136.4).

Each Deva is the form of Agni and Agni is the son of Waters (*Apāṁ napāt*). The Gods discovered

beautiful Agni hidden in the waters under the care of the seven sisters (RV. III. 1. 3, अविन्दन्नु दर्शतमप्स्वन्तर्देवासो अग्निमपसि स्वसॄणाम्). The first to be born from the ocean of Ṛita was Agni or Sūrya or Indra which is the symbol of the cosmic rhythm expressed as creation and dissolution.

Mantra II

7. AMṚITA-MṚITYU-VĀDA :—Mantra 2 refers to the doctrine of immortality and death, the former is the Deva and the latter is Bhūta ; the one is energy and the other matter, the one is divine and the other human, the one is beyond time and space and the other conditioned by time-space relata, the one stands for the principle of rest and the other for motion. In this way the two principles have diverse connotations and stand out as a coherent formula so intrinsically inseparable from each other that the Śatpatha Brāhmaṇa speaks of *Amṛita* existing within *Mṛityu* and of *Mṛityu* within *Amrita* (ŚB. X. 5.2.4). In creation both coexist. It is said that Aditi, the mother of Gods, gave birth to eight sons, seven of whom were the Āditya Immortals and the eighth was Sūrya. Aditi coaxed the first batch to create but with immortality alone as their possession they did not succeed. Then she turned to Mārtaṇḍa or Sūrya who combines in himself both *Amṛita* and *Mṛityu*, Life and Death, Energy and Matter and he was able to bring Life to the level of Matter. In the eyes of the Ṛishis Sūrya is the sign

of demarcation between immortality and death, that which is on this side of the Sun is in the grip of death or time and that which is beyond is in the lap of Amṛita—

स एष मृत्युस्तद्यत्किंचार्वाचीनमादित्यात्सर्वं तन्मृत्युनाप्तम्
अथ य एनमत ऊर्ध्वं चिनुते स पुनर्मृत्युमपजयति

(ŚB. 10.5.1.4)

8. AHORĀTRA-VĀDA—This was another name of the Kāla doctrine, i.e. Time as the supreme cause of the worlds manifested as a rhythm which is visible in the smaller and greater units of time. For example, Ahorātra, the two-halves of the month, the seasons, the two semesters of the year, the *Manavantara* periods and the further astronomical measures of time—at every point there is a rhythm in which time presses on time as the supreme impeller and no other extraneous force or power is needed to explain the recurrent phenomenon of cosmic manifestation (कालं कालेन पीडयन्, मनु). The advocates of this doctrine had a long history and their tenets were of the widest acceptance by the teachers of both the Vedic and materialist schools. The Atharva Veda gives a systematic account of the belief of the Kāla-Vāda metaphysics (AV. 19. 53. 14). All the created worlds are the chariot wheels of time. Time is a prolific horse who knows no decay and whose thousand eyes are turned to every space. He bears every one onward. Immortality is the axle of

the chariot which moves on seven rolling wheels. He is the primal Deity, Deva whom all invoke. He is Kāla, Full Vase overflowing with life. He is the son of the Self-existent Father ; there is no other power than he. Heaven and Earth were created by him and he stirred to motion what is and what will be. In Kāla all things have their being including Mind and Prāṇa. The highest Brahman is in Him ; the Fiery principle wherever we see it is the product of Kāla, who is the father of Prajāpati and the lord of all. He made this universe and stirred it to motion and on him it rests. He is the support of the universal principle known as Parameshṭhī, Kāla is self-made, whom we know as Kaśyapa Prajāpati, the on-looking creator. The sun ascends by Kāla, and in Kāla sinks again to rest. From Kāla sprang the twin principles of *Ṛik* and *Yajus*. In Kāla is the cosmic Yajña which is the eternal food for the gods. Both this world and the world that is lofty exist in Kāla. Kāla has conquered all the worlds and is supplicated by all as God Supreme.

The Night and Day unit (*Ahorātra*) is but a sample, an examplar of Mahā-Kāla which has taken form and all the mystery which exists in the source exists also in each fleeting moment of time. It is the great divine Horse of the Aśvamedha sacrifice. Time-Horse is being cut to pieces limb by limb but it does not decay or die. This intricate and lofty philosophical doctrine had many ramifications. For example, the conception

of Garutmā Suparṇa, the, metres, the Chakra both as Kāla-chakra and Brahma-chakra, Darśa-Paurṇamāsa sacrifices and Manvantaras were linked to the metaphysics of Kāla. The adepts in this knowledge were known as Ahorātra-vids. In Purāṇic imagery Kāla is symbolized as the Ṛishi Mārkaṇḍeya who has a life of a thousand year (*Sahasrāyu*). At the end of the period of dissolution when Lord Vishṇu starts afresh his chain of creativity, Mārkaṇḍeya is expelled out of the womb of Nārāyaṇa and witnesses the miracle of the eternal life principle incarnating as a child and floating on a leaf on the surface of the Infinite Ocean.

9. DEVA-VĀDA—In verse 6 there is a reference to the Gods (*Devāḥ*) and a hypothesis is suggested that the cosmos was created by the activity of Devas, but as the divine powers themselves were subsequents to the birth of cosmos it is doubtful whether its mystery is known even to them. The doctrine of the Devas is the most widely accepted one in the Ṛigveda as the root cause of the cosmos. The Devas stand for the divine principle at all levels, viz. Mind, Life and Matter and there is no doubt that the Ṛishis had a deep belief in the potency of differentiated Prāṇic energies conceived of as the Devas who have produced these worlds and living beings and are sustaining them. One could say that of all the points of view enunciated in the Ṛigveda the one about the Devas is the most comprehensive in which all others

become merged. Deva is literally the principle of light that shines in all times and places. The nature of that light is a vibration, a quivering, a process of contraction and expansion which bears the mystico-theological appellation of Prāṇa. It is stated that in the beginning one transcedent Asura of mighty Prāṇic principle presided over all the Gods (महद् देवानामसुरत्वमेकम्).

He was called Asura because in him was concealed the *Asu* or Prāṇa or the life germ which becomes mainifested as so many Devas or divine powers that are in heaven and on earth. It is argued that the Devas also do not know the mystery of creation since the thousand headed Purusha whom they offered as an oblation in the cosmic sacrifice existed prior to their birth.

10. BRAHMA-VĀDA—The whole burden of this Sūkta is to trace the creation to its source in a transcedent being who is here called *Adhyaksha* existing in the highest Empyrean (*Parame vyoman*, RV. X.129.7). The word Brahman has not been used in this sūkta, but there is hardly any doubt that the same is suggested by an overwhelming force of symbolical words. He is referred to as Ekam in mantra 2 and that one is suggestively called Parātpara, the Asbolute beyond which nothing else existed (तस्माद्धान्यन्न परः किंचनास, RV. X.129.2). The appropriate symbol for the transcendent reality is given as Ābhu, the all-encompassing

reality, which becomes modified in one of its portions as the cosmos. This later is called *tuchchhya*, a minute unit in comparison to the Ābhu that surrounds it.

The Nāsadīya Sūkta is a model of brevity and compact thought presenting the highest metaphysical doctrine in only three and a half mantras. In mantra 2 the transcendent reality called Ekam is said to be of the nature of Prāṇa in that it was breathing but there was no material breath to sustain that life (*Ānīd avātam*). How such a thing is possible no one knows nor can explain. The self-existent Creator lives in his own right and this power is referred to here as *Svadhā.* Its precise genesis is an unknown mystery. Some call it the Līlā or Krīḍā of the Lord. The word *Svadhā* points to the self of the Creator as a substance by which the creation is brought into being.

Mantra III

TWO-FOLD TAMAS PRINCIPLES :—In mantra 3 there is a reference to the two principles of Tamas, the one higher and the other lower, the latter being enveloped in the womb of the former. It is an *Anugama* reference depending on the exigencies of interpretation. The idea is that the two parents of the cosmos, viz. Svayambhū and Parameśthī both were concealed in their source ; the first as an unmanifested and the second as formless manifestation. A

reference to the second one is found in the mantra itself, viz. *Salilam*, the Waters also called *Āpaḥ*, *Samudram*, or the mother principle in which creation (*Idaṃ sarvam*) was concealed as something mysterious and unknown (*Apraketam*). This was the mother principle or Parameṣṭhī, the universal which is the latent source of the individual creation both on the level of the cosmos and in each living being. The mother with her womb creating the child is symbolised as Night (or Darkness) (*Tamas.*) The other higher and deeper *tamas* is the transcendent principle called Svayambhū, the self-existent Brahman symbolised as an unknown and unknowable factor like the absolute arithmetical point. It is referred to as *Anirukta*, *Amūrta* and Ka Prajāpati i.e. the father principle which creates his counterpart as his *Mahimā* or *Mahat*.

ĀBHU AND TUCHCHHYA :—These two principles are referred to as *Ābhu* and *Tuchchhya*. The *Ābhu* is the same as the thousand-headed Purusha (RV. X.90.1) and also the Purusha with heads, eyes, arms and feet on all sides.

विश्वतश्चक्षुरुत विश्वतोमुखो विश्वतो बाहुरुत विश्वतस्पात्

(RV. X. 81.3).

Such a being can only be a Prāṇa Purusha in which all the undifferentiated faculties exists at all points as soon as the individuated Purusha begins to be formed each limb is located separately. This is the difference

between the Avyakta and Vyakta, and between what is known in Śaiva Iconography as the Liṅga Vigraha and Purusha Vigraha, the former is merely a symbol of all the possibilities of existence whereas in the latter they take a definite form and shape.

The next important word which refers to creation is *tuchchhya* which signifies a dimensional form which is always termed as smaller or measured with respect to one which is beyond all measure. For example, the circumference evolved out of its centre is always to be deemed as inferior with respect to its source. The centre is Purusha and the circumference is its *Mahimā* (RV.X. 90.2), the former always taking precedence of the latter, the one being known as *Ūrdhva* and the other as *Iha* i.e. the non-directional particular point in a geometrical frame-work. It is the secret of Vedic doctrine that the absolute transcendent Brahman called *Ābhu* or *Ananta* becomes modified by his own creative self and that becomes the *Saṁsāra*.

How this creational bifercation takes place is mentioned in the last part of mantra 3. It is the power of Tapas which transforms the point into its greatness. Tapas elsewhere is known as the primeval Heat (*Agraja tapas*), *Devaushṇya*, the divine heat or an incalculable explosion of energy called *Abhīddha tapas* (RV. X. 190.1). The source, nature and effect of this Tapas which could have existed and functioned

as an infinite ocean of the waves of Prāṇa (*Samañchanaprasāraṇa*) or Light and Heat (*Jyoti and Ghraṁsa*) cannot be determined. What actually happens as a result of this activity is the creation of individual centres as whirl pools of energy which the Ṛishi here speaks of as Ekam. This one also was an unknown factor called Avyaya Purusha or Aja and *Kimapisvid* (किमपिस्विद्) something which is beyond comprehension. (RV. I. 1.64.6).

Mantra IV

PRINCIPLE OF KĀMA :—Mantra 4 takes up the clue of the creative process after the one centre comes into being in the midst of the universal, it is known as the Mind, Manas or Consciousness with all its potentialities to begin to function as a centre. The basic quality of mind is Kāma. It was the first principle to come into existence as mentioned here by the words *Agre* and *Prathamam*. According to the Upanishads Manas is known variously as *Prajñāna*, *Saṁjñāna*, *Vijñāna*, *Saṅkalpa*, *Manīshā*, *Smṛiti*, *Kratu*, *Asu*, *Kāma*, *Hṛidaya* etc. and that Prajñāna is Brahma itself comprehending within its meaning and substance Brahma, Indra, Prajapati and all the Gods (*Aitareya Up.*, III. 2).

The word Kāma, literally desire, refers also to the basic faculty by which the one principle becomes split up into two as the two halves of a single Egg, or the two parent called Dvāyā-Pṛithivī, the father and

the mother principles, Agni and Soma, or the eternal man and the eternal woman. They are bound to each other by the most subtle principle of Love or Desire on the triple plane of Mind, Life and Matter. Kāma is the fecundating seed that germinates in the form of each living organism in the womb of the mother. It is a mysterious power which vitalises the whole consciousness. It is Nature's own technique to prepetuate life on the plane of manifestation. The life span as expressed in each cell is designed to prepare each organism for the consumation of the secret of Love. Kāma in this sense is a divine act symbolised in Vedic term as the marriage of heaven and earth or the sacrament which throws open the flood gate for the descent of immortal Prāṇa in mortal matter. The union of Deva and Bhūta is accomplished through Kāma which becomes manifested as the principle of the Mind.

KINSHIP OF SAT-MATTER WITH ASAT-PRĀṆA :— The second part of this mantra refers to the kinship between Sat and Asat. Sat here signifies the world of Matter and Asat the divine principle of Prāṇa or Life. The Śatapatha makes this definition clear that the principle of Prāṇa is termed in the esoteric languages of the Vedas as Asat (*Prāṇā vā rishayaḥ asat*, ŚB. 6.1.1.1). It is stated elsewhere that in the cosmic activity of the divine pewers it is the Asat which

creates Sat, viz. the principle of Prāṇa or life or conciousness which creates matter,

देवानां पूर्व्ये युगे ऽसतो सदजायत ।

RV. X. 72.2.

Although mind and matter are diametrically oppossed they are inseparable companions in each organic centre or the living body. It is to this dominant relationship that the mantra makes a specific reference. Both are *sabandhu* viz. kith and kin, which is the same as the doctrine of having a common womb (*Sayoni*). The living is the kin of the dead (matter) and the immortal has a common womb with the mortal,

जीवो मृतस्य चरति स्वधाभिरमर्त्यो मर्त्येना सयोनिः ।

RV. I. 164.30.

Living consciousness as manifested in matter is the supreme mystery which is a burden of these mantras. The poets direct the power of their inspired mind to the unravelling of this top mystery. A union of mind with matter is a fact of which each one is a witness to one's ownself although no science or philosophy can explain how it has happened. The embroyonic development of the mind and the body and all the psychical, vital and physical functionings and powers of thought, emotions, feelings etc. are a miracle of which the secrets are unknown.

Mantra V is couched partly in the language of wonderment, cogitating on the obscure nature of the mystery, and partly trying to approach the problem in the manner of science, tackling with such a reality as *Retas* or the Seed and its assuming a majesty *Mahimā* by systematic germination and growth. The reference to *Raśmi*, a ray of light is quite happy in the context of Vedic symbolism where the supreme divine reality is conceived of as Brahman or the Supernal Sun with a thousand rays of which a single ray is reflected in each living centre. If we look at the word of the mantra with deeper insight the question arises as to what is the ray, why it is said to be coming from the oblique side and who are the divinities that claim this spark to be their own. The answers to these three questions are significant in this context. The ray of light is Prāṇa, its source is the immortal divine consciousness or Vijñāna which is the same as Sūrya, the symbol of Brahman. The deities which cluster round this Ray are those known as the Light-sipping Devas, *Marīchipa Devas* (VS. VII. 3). All the powers that are in heaven and on the earth, i.e. in the immortal divine source and in mortal matter are present in the single prāṇic radiant principle called Life. Although it is one and indivisible still it is differentiated within the living organism as so many different Devas or prāṇic centres each sipping its own light or radiant energy. There is not a single cell of matter where the radiant Deva principle called Prāṇa does

not incarnate. This radiant spark of light is said to spread in an oblique direction (*Tiraśchīna*), which implies that it creates its *maṇḍala* or *mahimā* with itself as the source or centre (cf. VS. 32. 2, *Ūrdhva, Adhaḥ*, and *Tiryak*). The four cardinal and the four intermediate directions form the sphere which the Prāṇa as Light-ray pervades (cf. *sa sadhrīchīḥ sa vishūchīr vasānaḥ*, RV. I. 164. 31). Those who see it are left wondering–'whether it has come from below', 'whether it has come from above'. The words *Adhaḥ* and *Upari* are relative and symbolical, the former refers to the manifested form in matter and the latter to the unmanifested source in the divine transcendent reality. The former is *Eka-pāda, Adhaḥ, Iha*; the latter is *Tripād, Ūrdhva, Upari*. Both remind us of a rich terminology familiar in many mantras and different formulations.

The Ṛishi then refers to two kinds of Devas, firstly those who are inherent in the seed or germinal state; wherever the seed is deposited the Devas or divine powers are incipient in it, forming its invisible or potential centre. The second class of Devas are called *Mahimānaḥ*, i.e. those manifesting as the greatness or majesty of the centre in the form of the circumference. *Mahimā* is the same as *Maṇḍala* which refers to the totality of the manifested powers which had their latent existence in the invisible source. Thus all manifestation is an interplay of

these two aspects of the single creative act constituted as the seed and the organism. The one is hidden (*paroksha*), the other is visible (*pratyaksha*); the one is Prāṇa (Energy) the other is Bhūta (Matter). These may be imagined as the two wheels of the car of Indra, i.e. the central vital Prāṇa (*Madhya Prāṇa*, ŚB. VI. 1. 1.) who is present in each living organism.

The same imagery is extended in the fourth part of the mantra under the symbolical term *Svadhā* and *Prayati*. *Prayati* is *Prāṇa*, the regulating centre which is the same as the seed, or in other terms *Sthiti* or *Pratishṭhā*. We are reminded here of the explanation given to the letter *Ya* of Hṛidaya, i.e. *Yamayati*, that which governs and controls the manifest form, itself acting as the centre. The other principle is called *Svadhā* which is responsible for creating the Pitṛis. The Pitṛis are the Father-Mother principles operative behind each manifest form. *Svadhā* corresponds to *Mahimā* and *Prayati* to *Retodhā*, the two pairs typifying an appropriate terminology of the divine formless reality and the material forms or corporeal modality on the plane of matter. As explained earlier the one is Sat and the other Asat and both exist as an essential pair. The doctrine of the two co-existing is formulated as *Para* and *Avara*, Prayati or the source being *Parastāt* and Svadhā or the manifest form being *Avastāt*.

Mantras VI & VII

The last two mantras are couched in the language

typical to Vedic scepticism throwing open the flood-gates of doubt and bold enquiry knowing no bound :

Who verily knows and who can declare it ?
Whence it was born and whence comes this creation ?
The Gods are later than the world production.
Who knows then whence it first came into being ?
He, the first origin of this creation, whether he formed
it all or did not form it,
Whose eye controls this world in highest heaven,
He verily knows it, or perhaps he knows not.

Such a confession of ignorance should have been rooted in deep knowledge. In the worlds of Maurice Maeterlinck : 'Is it possible to find in our human annals, words more majestic, more full of solemn anguish, more august in tone, more devout, more terrible ? Where could we find at the very foundation of life a completer and more irreduciable confession of ignorance ? Where, from the depths of our agonsticism, which thousands of years have augmented, can we point to a wider horizon ? At the very outset it passes all that has been said, and goes farther than we shall ever dare to go, lest we fall into despair, for it does not fear to ask itself whether the Supreme Being knows what He has done—knows whether He is or is not the Creator, and questions whether He has become conscious of Himself.'

No doubt the Nāsadīya Sūkta touches the highest point in the philosophy of India. It is the most im-

portant contribution of the Ṛigveda to Indian metaphysics, as observed by Keith writing about this hymn of creation :

The poem commences with an assertion : in the beginning there was neither being nor not-being : there was no atmosphere nor sky: the question is asked what covering there was, and was there a fathomless abyss of waters. There was neither death nor immortality, nor night nor day. There was nothing else in the world save the one which breathed, but without wind, of its own power. There was, however, darkness, and a moving ocean without light: through the might of fervour, Tapas, was born a living force enveloped in a shell. Then there developed desire, Kāma, the first seed of mind: the sages found the root of not-being, searching for it in the heart. Thus far the first four verses: the fifth is a puzzle: it may be referred to the sages who drove a division through the universe and distinguished the upper and the lower, the world of nature above, the principle of nature below: but this version is wholly problematical. The next two verses end with a deep expression of doubt : the gods are later than the creation and cannot know of its origin: whether the creation was made by itself or not, the overseer of it in the highest space of heaven he knows of it, or perhaps he knows not.

The hymn is clearly difficult to understand: the part of the seers, which appears merely as a statement

of what their reflections have arrived at, is even understood by Bloomfield to be a cosmical action, indicating that they took part in the creation of the universe. This seems, however, unnatural and strained, but not more so than the interpretation of verse 5 adopted by Deussen, which would make it into an assertion that the sages were able to discriminate between the thing in itself and the phenomenal world, between natura naturans and natura naturate. What is clear is that there is conceived as first existing one thing, which is described as breathing without wind, an effort to express a primitive nature different in essence from anything known to the priest, conceived perhaps metaphorically only as a dark ocean or chaos. In this through Tapas, which here must rather be cosmic than refer to the activity of seers or other human powers, by inward fervour, springs up the being enveloped in a shell, which in the later conception is the golden world egg. The next step in development is the appearance of desire, unless that it is to be taken as born of mind, when it is described as the first seed of mind. If so, the mind must be deemed to be an attribute of the one which develops in the shell, whence springs desire: in the alternative the phrase may be taken as the source which produces mind, and desire, unconscious will, may be held to produce conscious will or mind. The latter view,

however, is unnatural in point of language and has the additional disadvantage that in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka we already find that mind is given as prior to desire in a passage which is based on the hymn. Nor can we hold—and this is much more important—that Kāma was conceived as unconscious will: it is rather the natural expression for conscious desire, which would rise from the existence of mind as a substratum. The later philosophy makes the knowledge of desires depend on the existence of mind, and this idea may be foreshadowed here, where mind is made a cosmic *prius* of desire. Beyond this the poet does not go: he ends with the suggestion of a supreme deity as distinct from the gods who are created, and ends with a doubt whether such a deity has power of knowledge, that is, whether it has consciousness at all. We cannot, therefore, really say whether or not the first cause of the world is deemed a conscious entity at all: the assertion that it was not the first cause of the world is not not-being, which is in words a little inconsistent with the assertion that the sages found the root of being in not-being, searching in the heart, is in effect an assertion that it was a peculiar sort of being, different from ordinary being. The reference to the heart, however, as the place of search reminds us that the heart even in the Rigveda seems the abode of mind, and suggests that in the ultimate issue the final entity might be deemed to be possessed

of mind, for consciousness, without an object, is the nature in the Vedanta of the Brahman and even of Puruṣa in the Sāṁkhya. This hymn is the finest effort of the imagination of the Vedic poet, and nothing else equals it." (The Religion & Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, pp. 435-437).

MACDONELL'S TRANSLATION

1. Non-being then existed not, nor being :
There was no air, nor heavens which is beyond it.
What motion was there? Where? By whom directed?
Was water there, and fathomless abysses?

2. Death then existed not, nor life immortal ;
Of neither night nor day was any semblance.
The One breathed calm and windless by self-impulse :
There was not any other thing beyond it.

3. Darkness at first was covered up by darkness ;
This universe was indistinct and fluid.
The empty space that by the void was hidden,
That One was by the force of heat engendered.

4. Desire then at the first arose within it,
Desire, which was the earliest seed of spirit.
The bond of being in non-being sages
Discovered searching in their hearts with wisdom.

5. Their ray extended light across the darkness:
But was the One above or was it under?
Creative force was there, and fertile power:
Below was energy, above was impulse.

6. Who knows it truly? who can here declare it?
Whence was it born? whence issued this creation?
And did the gods appear with its production?
But then who knows from whence it has arisen?

7. This world-creation, whence it has arisen,
Or whether it has been produced or has not,
He who surveys it in the highest heaven,
He only knows, or ev'n he does not know it.

[A. A. MACDONELL]
Sanskrit Literature (1900) pp. 136-37.

MACDONELL'S COMMENTS

Macdonell calls it the Hymn Of Creation and says that in this cosmogonic poem the origin of world is explained as the evolution of the existence (*Sat*) from the non-existent (*Asat*). Water thus came into being first; from it was evolved intelligence by heat. It is the starting-point of natural philosophy which developed into the Sāṅkhya system.

He writes: Apart from its high literary merit, this poem is most noteworthy for the daring speculations which find utterance in so remote an age. But even here may be traced some of the main defects of Indian Philosophy—lack of clearness and consistency, with a tendency to make reasoning depend on mere words. Being the only piece of sustained speculation in the Ṛigveda, it is the starting-point of the natural philosophy which assumed shape in the evolutionary Sāṅkhya system. It will, moreover, always retain a general interest as the earliest specimen of Aryan philosophic thought. With the theory of the Song of Creation, that after the non-existent had developed into the existent, water came first, and then intelligence was evolved from it by heat, the cosmogonic accounts of the Brāhmaṇas substantially agree. Here, too, the non-existent becomes the existent, of which the first form is the waters.

On these floats Hiraṇyagarbha, the cosmic golden egg, whence is produced the spirit that desires and creates the universe. Always requiring the agency of the creator Prajāpati at an earlier or a later stage, the Brāhmaṇas in some of their accounts place him first, in others waters. This fundamental contradiction, due to mixing up the theory of creation with that of evolution, is removed in the Sāṅkhya system by causing Purusha, or soul, to play the part of a passive spectator, while Prakṛiti, or primordial matter, undergoes successive stages of development. The cosmogonic hymns of the Ṛigveda are not only thus the precursors of Indian philosophy, but also of the Purāṇas, one of the main objects of which is to describe the origin of the world. (*Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 137—38).

According to him in the first verse the subject of *āsīt* is 'this universe' which in the beginning was neither non-existent nor existent. *Tadānīm* signifies before the creation. The word *ambhas* refers to the existence of the water, the ocean in the beginning.

In verse 5 the word *Raśmi* is important. According to Macdonell the meaning of this word here is uncertain, but it may be an explanation of *bandhu* in 4c: the cord with which the sages (referred to by *eshām*) in thought measured out the distance between the existent and the non-existent, or between what was above and below; cp. 8. 25, 18, *pari yo raśminā*

divo antān mame prithivyāḥ, Who with a cord has measured out the ends of heaven and earth; cp. also the expression *Sūtraṁ vitatam* (in A. V. X. 8. 37), the *extended string* with reference to the earth. *Retodhās* and *Mahimānaḥ* are constrasted as male and female cosmogonic principles, to which correspond respectively *Prayatis* and *Svadhā*. In T. S. 4. 3. 11. 1. mention is made of *Trayo Mahimānaḥ* connected with fertility. (*Vedic Reader*, p. 210). But in his later metrical translation printed in *Hymns From the Ṛigveda*, he changed the meaning to 'ray', which we have also explained.

H.H. Wilson translated this Hymn as follows :—

The deity is Paramātmā, the author of the creation, preservation and dissolution of the various entities (*bhavas*), these being the subjects treated of in the hymn; the Ṛishi is Paramātmā, under his appellation Parameshṭhin.

1. The non-existent was not, the existent was not; then the world was not, nor the firmament, nor that which is above (the firmament). How could there be any investing envelope, and where? Of what (could there be) felicity? How (could there be) the deep unfathomable water?

2. Death was not nor at that period immortality, there was no indication of day or night;

THAT ONE unbreathed upon breathed of his own strength, other than THAT there was nothing else whatever.

3. There was darkness covered by darkness in the beginning, all this (world) was undistinguishable water; that empty united (world) which was covered by a mere nothing was produced through the power of austerity.

4. In the beginning there was desire, which was the first seed of mind; sages having meditated in their hearts have discovered by their wisdom the connection of the existent with the non-existent.

5. Their ray was stretched out, whether across, or below, or above; (some were shedders of seed, (others) were mighty; food was inferior, the eater was superior.

6. Who really knows? Who in this world may declare it? Whence was this creation, whence was it engendered? The gods (were) subsequent to the (world's) creation; so who knows whence it arose?

7. He from whom this creation arose, he may uphold it, or he may not (no one else can);

he who is its superintendent in the highest heaven, he assuredly knows, or if he knows not (no one else does).

(Ṛigveda Translation) Vol. VI, pp. 236-37.

WILSON'S COMMENTS

1. THE NON-EXISTENT, ETC.—To render this phraseology intelligible we must restrict the meanings of *sat* and *asat* ("ens" and "non-ens") to visible and invisible existence, or in Hindu consmology to matter and spirit (*prakṛiti* and *purusha*), which in the Vaidika system would not, as in the Sāṅkhya, have a distinct existence, but would be blended and lost in the one invisible, immaterial, incomprehensible First Cause, or Brahma, in the intervals of creation. The language used in describing this is usually somewhat vague, but the notion is evidentlv that the First Cause was in the beginning undeveloped in its effects, and existed before either inactive matter or active spirit, considered as distinct ; it is not intended to be said that no cause or origin, no author of the universe, existed before creation, but that nothing else existed, neither matter nor spirit, and consequently that He created both: see the Vishṇu Purāṇa, p. 12, where a similar passage is cited from the Veda, and this passage also is quoted by the

commentator (Ibid., note 16): though it is not perhaps quite accurately explained.

ANY INVESTING ENVELOP—The Scholiast refers to the Purāṇas for an explanation, and accordingly see Vishṇu Purāṇa, p. 16, and note 25. Each element as created or developed is invested by its rudiment.

OF WHAT COULD THERE BE FELICITY—I.e., of whom or of what living being could enjoyment, or fruition, whether of pain or pleasure, be predicated, there being no life ?

HOW COULD......WATER—Sāyaṇa explains away another text, *idam agre salilam āsīt* "this in the begining was water," by saying that that referred to another period.

2. BREATHED OF HIS OWN STRENGTH—Sāyaṇa takes *Svadhā* as meaning *Māyā* or *Prakṛiti* (Illusion or Nature), the source of the world of phenomena. He understands *Saha* "breathed along with Māyā."

3. THROUGH THE POWER OF AUSTERITY—*Tapas* is said to mean not penance, but the contemplation of the things which were to be created.

4. THERE WAS DESIRE—i.e., in the mind of the Supreme Being.

5. THEIR RAY WAS STRETCHED OUT—This according to Sāyaṇa, refers to the suddenness of creation, which was developed in the twinkling of an eye, like the flash of the sun's ray. It was so quick,

he continues, that it was doubtful whether the things in the central space (understood by the world "across") were cread first, or those above or those below; in other words, creation took place simultaneously in all three portions of the universe. Sāyaṇa tries to reconcile this with the received notion of creation in a series, (viz., that from *Ātmā* came the *ākāśa*, and from the *ākāśa* the wind, from the wind fire, etc.) by saying that this was the order in which things were created, but the development of the world was like a flash of lightning, so that the series could not be distinguished.)

WHETHER ACROSS, OR BELOW, OR ABOVE—The word *tiraśchīnaḥ*, "across," perhaps refers to the *tiryaksrotas*, "that in which the stream of life is horizontal," i.e., the animal world. The epithets in the second line of the verse are unusual and obscure; according to Sāyaṇa, the meaning is that among the created objects some were living creatures, others were great, as the sky, etc., the former being the enjoyers (*bhoktāraḥ*), the latter the things to be enjoyed (*bhojyāḥ*), so the creation was distinguished as the food and the feeder. The verse occurs in Yajush, XXXIII. 74, where Mahīdhara gives it several different interpretations, none more intelligible than those of Sāyaṇa.

6. WHENCE WAS......ENGENDERED—I.e., from what material cause, and from what creative cause, did it arise?

Comments of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (10. 5. 3. 1)

COSMOS AS MIND

नेव वाऽइदमग्रेऽसदासीन्नेव सदासीत् । आसीदिव वाऽइदमग्रे नेवासीत्तद्ध तन्मन एवास ॥१॥

तस्मादेतदृषिणाभ्यूनक्तम् । नासदासीन्नो सदासीत्तदानीमिति नेव हि सन्मनो नेवासत् ॥२॥

तदिदं मनः सृष्टमाविरबुभूषत् । निरुक्ततरं मूर्ततरं तदात्मानमन्वैच्छत्तत्तपोऽतप्यत तत्प्रामूर्च्छत्तत्षट् त्रिंशतं सहस्राण्यपश्यदात्मनोऽग्नीनर्कान्मनोमयान्मनश्चितस्ते मनसैवाधीयन्त मनसाचीयन्त मनसैषु ग्रहा अगृह्यन्त मनसास्तुवत मनसाशंसन्यत्किं च यज्ञे कर्म क्रियते यत्किं च यज्ञियं कर्म मनसैव तेषु तन्मनोमयेषु मनश्चित्सु मनोमयमक्रियत तद्यत्किं चेमानि भूतानि मनसा संकल्पयन्ति तेषामेव सा कृतिस्तानेवादधति तांश्चिन्वन्ति तेषु ग्रहान्गृह्णन्ति तेषु स्तुवते तेषु शंसन्त्येतावती वै मनसो विभूतिरेतावती विसृष्टिरेतावन्मनः षटत्रिंशत्सहस्राण्यग्नयोऽर्कास्तेषामेकैक एव तावान्यावानसौ पूर्वः ॥३॥

शतपथ ब्राह्मण १०।५।३।१-३

1. Verily, in the beginning this (universe) was, as it were, neither non-existent nor existent; in the beginning this (universe), indeed, as it were, existed and did not exist: there was then only that Mind.

2. Wherefore, it has been said by the Ṛishi (Ṛig-Veda X, 129, 1), 'There was then neither the non-existent nor the existent;' for Mind was, as it were, neither existent nor non-existent.

3. This Mind, when created, wished to become manifest,—more defined, more substantial; it sought after a self (body). It practised austerity; it acquired consistency. It then beheld thirty-six thousand Arka-fires of its own self, composed of mind, built up of mind; mentally alone they were established (on sacrificial hearths) and mentally built up; mentally the cups (of Soma) were drawn thereat; mentally they chanted, and mentally they recited on (near) them,—whatever rite is performed at the sacrifice, whatever sacrificial rite there is, that was performed mentally only, as a mental performance, on those (fires or fire-altars) composed of mind, and built up of mind. And whatever it is that (living) beings here conceive in their mind that was done regarding those mental (Agnis):—they establish them (on the hearths) and build them up (as fire altars); they draw the cups for them; they chant on (near) them and recite hymns on them,—of that extent was the development of Mind, of that extent its creation,—so great is Mind: thirty-six thousand Arka-fires; and each of these as great as that former (fire-altar) was. [Eggeling]

Sāyaṇa's Commentary on the Nāsadīya Sūkta in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa [2. 8. 9. 3-6] differs from the above.

TAITTIRĪYA BRĀHMAṆA—SĀYAṆA'S COMMENTARY

नासदासीन्नो—

यदा पूर्वसृष्टिः प्रलीनोत्तरसृष्टिश्च नोत्पन्ना तदानीं सदसती द्वे अपि नाऽभूताम्। नामरूपविशिष्टत्वेन स्पष्टं प्रतीयमानं जगत्सच्छब्देनोच्यते। नरविषाणादिसमानं शून्यमसदित्युच्यते। तदुभयं नाऽऽसीत्। किन्तु काचिदव्यक्तावस्थाऽऽसीत्। सा च विस्पष्टत्वाभावान्न सती, जगदुत्पादकत्वेन सद्भावान्नाप्यसती। नो सदासीदिति यत्संग्रहेणोक्तं तदेव प्रपञ्च्यते—नाऽऽसीद्रजो रजःशब्देन सत्वरजस्तमोगुणत्रयमुपलक्ष्यते तत्त्रयं नाऽऽसीत्। नो व्योम, आकाशवाचिना व्योमशब्देन भूतपञ्चकमुपलक्ष्यते तदपि नाऽऽसीत्। यथोक्तगुणत्रयपञ्चभूतापेक्षयाऽपरः पदार्थोऽन्यो गिरिनदीसमुद्रादिको यत्-यो दृश्यते सोऽपि नाऽऽसीत्। यथा भूतानि नाऽऽसंस्तद्वद्भौतिकमपि नाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः। अनेन भूतभौतिकगुणत्रयनिषेधेन ब्रह्माण्डस्य निषेधः सम्पन्नः। अण्डाद्बहिर्महत्तत्त्वाद्यावरणानि पौराणिका वदन्ति तदेतदावरणजातमाक्षेपवाचिना किंशब्दत्रयेण निषिध्यते। आवरणस्य दृष्टिविषयभूतं किंचिदाव्रियमाणमपेक्षितम्। तत्राण्डाभावात्किमावरीवः किं नाम वस्तु तैरावरणैराव्रियेत। अतः सावरणकस्याऽसंभवादावरणमपि कुहेति देशाक्षेपः। निमित्ताक्षेपः कस्य शर्मन्निति। कुत्र देशे कस्य भोक्तुः सुखनिमित्तमिदमावरणं स्यात्, न त्वस्ति तदा कश्चिद्देशो नाऽपि सुखस्य भोक्ता कश्चिद्विद्यते। अत्र कश्चिन्मंदोऽवान्तरप्रलयविषयाम् "आपो वा इदमग्रे सलिलमासीत्" इति

श्रुतिं श्रुत्वा महाप्रलयेऽपि तथाविधं जलमस्तीति भ्राम्यति, तद्भ्रमव्युदासाय जलं निषिध्यते। गहनं प्रवेष्टुमशक्यं गभीरमगाधत्वेनावस्थातुमप्यशक्यं यदम्भस्तत्किमासीत्तदपि नाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः।
अथ द्वितीयामृचमाह—

न मृत्युरमृतं तर्हि न—

तर्हि तस्मिन्महाप्रलयकाले प्राणिनां मृत्युर्नाऽऽसीत्तेषामेवाभावात्। अत एवाऽमृतं जीवनमपि नाऽऽसीत्। रात्रियाः प्रकेतश्चिह्नं चन्द्रनक्षत्रादि, अह्नः प्रकेतः सूर्यस्तदुभयमपि नाऽऽसीत्। किंतु तत्सर्वोपनिषत्प्रसिद्धमेकं ब्रह्म वस्तु स्वधया स्वस्मिन्नाश्रितया सर्वजगत्कारणरूपया मायया सहितमानीच्चेष्टितवत्। नाऽत्र चलनं चेष्टा किंतु सद्भावमात्रमित्यभिप्रेत्यावातमिति विशेष्यते। वायुरहितं निश्चलमित्यर्थः। तस्मादेकस्माद्ब्रह्मणोऽन्यत्किञ्च किमपि परमुत्कृष्टं नाऽऽस नैवाऽऽसीत्। जगतो निषिद्धत्वान्निकृष्टं पूर्वमेव निराकृतम्। तस्मादुत्कृष्टं निकृष्टं च किमपि ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तं नाऽऽसीत्।

अथ तृतीयामाह—

तम आसीत्तमसा—

तमःशब्देनाविद्या-मायाशक्त्यादिशब्दवाच्यं जगद्विकारोपादानं मूलाज्ञानमुच्यते। यथा तमः पदार्थानावृणोत्येवमिदमपि ब्रह्मतत्त्वमावृणोतीति तमःशब्देन व्यवहारः। तादृशं जगद्विकारनिष्पादनक्षमं ब्रह्मण्याश्रितं किंचित्तम आसीत्। तेन तमसा सर्वं जगद्गूढं यथा मृत्पिण्डे घटो गूढो यथा वा बीजे वृक्षो गूढस्तद्वत्। अत एव प्रकेतं प्रकर्षेण ज्ञातुमशक्यम्। तथा च मनुना स्मर्यते—

आसीदिदं तमोभूतमप्रज्ञातमलक्षणम्।
अप्रतर्क्यमविज्ञेयं प्रसुप्तमिव सर्वतः॥ इति।

तत्र दृष्टान्तः—सलिलमिति यथा वर्षे पतिता वर्षोपलाः सलिलमात्रत्वेनाऽवशिष्यन्ते, तथा सर्वं जगदिदं तम आसीत्तमोमात्ररूपेणावशिष्टमित्यर्थः । अत्र हि कणादादयोऽसत्कार्यवादिनः कारणे पूर्वमविद्यमानमेव कार्यमुत्पद्यत इत्याहुः । सत्कार्यवादिनस्तु सांख्यादयः पूर्वं विद्यमानमेव कार्यमव्यक्तं सत्कारणव्यापारेण व्यक्तीभवतीत्याचक्षते । तत्र सत्कार्यवादिनां मतमेव तमसा गूढमिति श्रुत्याऽङ्गीकृतम् । आसमन्ताद्भवत्युत्पद्यत इत्याभूज्जगत्तदेतत्तुच्छेनापिहितम् । तत्त्वज्ञानमात्रेण निवर्त्यत्वात्तत्कारणं मूलाज्ञानं तुच्छं तेनाऽपिहितम् प्रलयकाल आच्छादितम् । तादृशं यज्जगदासीत्तज्जगदव्यक्तं सत्पूर्वोक्तादज्ञानरूपात्तमसः सकाशान्महिना महत्त्वेनाऽभिव्यक्तजगद्रूपेणाऽजायतोत्पन्नम् । तदिदमज्ञानदृष्ट्या जगदाकारेण भासमानमपि परमार्थत एकं ब्रह्मैव ।

चतुर्थीमाह—

कामस्तदग्रे—

परब्रह्मसंबन्धिनो मनसः प्रथमं रेत आद्यकार्यं यदासीत्तत्कार्यमग्रे सृष्ट्यादौ कामो भूत्वाऽधिसमवर्तताऽऽधिक्येनाऽऽविरभूत् । अयमर्थः—यदेतदेकमेवाऽद्वितीयं 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' इत्येवं रूपं वस्तु सृष्टेः पूर्वं तमसाऽऽवृतमासीत्तस्य तमोविशिष्टस्य ब्रह्मणः सिसृक्षारूपं यन्मन आदावुत्पन्नं तस्य मनसः काम एव प्रथमकार्यभूतः पदार्थः । स च काम उपनिषदि स्पष्टमाम्नातः—"सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेय" इति । एकोऽद्वितीयरूपोऽहमेव बहुविधो भवेयम् । तत्रायमुपायः पूर्वमवस्थितमद्वितीयरूपमनुपमृद्य प्रकर्षेण मायाकल्पितजगद्रूपेणोत्पद्येयेति तस्य वाक्यस्याऽर्थः । स च कामः सतो बन्धुरिदानीं सत्त्वेन प्रतीयमानस्य भूतभौतिकरूपस्य जगतोऽसच्छब्दाभिधेये तमस्यव्यक्ते बन्धनहेतुः । कामो ह्यज्ञाने सर्वं व्यवहारं बध्नाति । यथा निद्राणे

पुरुषे समुत्पन्ना चित्तवृत्तिर्नानाविधं स्वप्नव्यवहारं बध्नाति । यथा वा जागरणेऽप्यत्यन्तमलभ्ये विषये समुत्पन्ना तृष्णा सुख-दुःखपर्यन्तं मनोराज्यरूपं व्यवहारं बध्नाति, एवमयं परमेश्वरस्य कामो देवतिर्यङ्मनुष्यादिसर्वव्यवहारं बध्नाति। कवयो विद्वांसो वेदान्तपारं गता हृदि हृदयकमले मनीषा स्वबुद्ध्या प्रतीष्य विचार्याऽसत्यव्यक्ते तमसि कामं सत उत्पत्स्यमानस्य जगतो बन्धुं बन्धनहेतुं निरविन्दन्निश्चितवन्तः । कामस्य सर्वव्यवहारहेतुत्वं वाजसनेयिनः समामनन्ति—"अथो खल्वाहुः काममय एवायं-पुरुषः" इति । व्यासोऽपि स्मरति—"कामबन्धनमेवेदं नाऽन्य-दस्तीह बन्धनम्" इति ।

अस्मदनुभवोऽपि तथा दृश्यते। सर्वो हि पुरुषः प्रथमं किञ्चित्कामयित्वा तदर्थं प्रयतमानः सुखं दुःखं वा लभते । तस्माच्छ्रुतिस्मृत्यनुभवसिद्धत्वात्काम एव सर्वव्यवहारहेतुरिति विदुषां निश्चयः।

अथ पञ्चमीमाह—

तिरश्चीनो—

रश्मिः सूर्यरश्मिसमानः कश्चित्स्वयंप्रकाशश्चैतन्यपदार्थः। एषां भूतभौतिकरूपाणां जगद्वस्तूनां मध्ये तिरश्चीनस्तिर्यग्वर्तमानो विततो व्याप्तः स चैतन्यरूपः परमात्माऽमीषां पदार्थानामधोभागेऽवस्थितः। किंवोपरिभागेऽवस्थितः। स्विच्छब्दौ विकल्पितपक्षद्वयसूचनार्थौ। प्लुतिर्विचारद्वयद्योतनार्था। अयमभिप्रायः—सोऽयं प्रकाशः कश्चि-च्चैतन्यपदार्थः सर्वेषां वस्तूनां मध्ये पर्यालोच्यमानो दीर्घतन्तुवत्तिर्य-ग्भूतो व्याप्याऽवभासते। अधः पर्यालोच्यमानस्तत्राऽप्यवभासते। उपरि पर्यालोच्यमानस्तत्राऽप्यवभासते। तस्मादध ऊर्ध्वं मध्ये च भासमानत्वादेकत्रैवाऽवस्थित इति वक्तुमशक्यः। यथा घट-

स्योपादानभूतो मृत्पिण्डो घटस्याधऊर्ध्वमध्यभागेषु सर्वेष्वनुवर्तते, एवं तत्तत्पदार्थोपादानानि तत्तत्कार्येषु व्याप्यैव वर्तन्ते। एवमयं परमात्माऽपि स्वकार्येषु व्याप्य वर्तमानः सन्नध आसीदित्येव वोपर्यासीदित्येव वा निश्चेतुमशक्य इति। सर्वे एते पदार्था भूतभौतिकरूपाः पूर्वोक्तस्य विततरश्मिरूपस्य स्वप्रकाशचैतन्यस्य रेतोधाः साररूपधारिण आसन्। तत्र चिदेकरसस्य हि वस्तुनः सद्रूपं सारं तच्च सर्वे पदार्था धारयन्ति, अस्तीत्येवं स्वरूपेणैव सर्वेषामवभासमानत्वात्। ते च सद्रूपधारिणः सर्वे महिमानो गिरिनद्यादिरूपेण महान्त आसन्। एवं स्वधाशब्दवाच्यमायाऽविद्यादिशब्देनाऽभिधीयमाना पारमेश्वरी शक्तिरवस्तादधमं कारणम्। प्रयतिः सा शक्तिः प्रयतते यस्मिन्परमात्मनि सोऽयं शक्तिप्रयत्नाधारः परमात्मा प्रयतिः। स च परस्तात्परममुत्तमं कारणम्। तावेतौ शक्तिपरमात्मानावेव जगत्कारणभूतौ प्रकृतिपुरुषाविति शास्त्रेषु व्यपदिश्येते।

अथ षष्ठीमाह—

को अद्धा—

अत्र केचिदागममुपेक्ष्य स्वस्वबुद्धिबलादन्यथाऽन्यथोत्प्रेक्षन्ते। तथाहि—परमाणवो मूलकारणमिति कणादगौतमादयो मन्यन्ते। स्वतन्त्रमचेतनं प्रधानं जगतो मूलकारणमिति कपिलप्रभृतयः। शून्यादितो जगदुत्पत्तिरिति माध्यमिकाः। जगतः कारणमेव नाऽस्ति स्वभावत एवऽवतिष्ठत इति लोकायतिकाः। ते सर्वेऽपि भ्रान्ता एव। कोऽद्धा वेद जगत्कारणं को नाम पुरुषः साक्षादवगच्छति। अनवगत्य च क इह प्रवोचत्स्वयमदृष्ट्वा को नाम जगत्कारणमीदृगिति वक्तुं शक्नोति। कोऽयमत्र वक्तव्यांश इति चेदुच्यते—इयं विविधा सृष्टिः कुत आजाता कस्मादुपादानकारणात्सर्वत उत्पन्ना, पुनरपि कुतो निमित्तादुत्पन्नेति तदिदमुपादानं

निमित्तं च वक्तव्यम्। वक्तुमशक्यम्। कुतोऽशक्तिरिति चेदुच्यते—किं देवा एतद्ब्रूयुः, उताऽन्यः कश्चिन्मनुष्यः। न तावद्देवा वक्तुं शक्तास्ते ह्यस्य जगतो विसर्जनाय विविधसृष्टेरर्वागेव विद्यन्ते। न तु सृष्टेः पूर्वं ते सन्ति। यदा देवानामपीदृशी गतिस्तदानीं यतो जगदाबभूव, तत्कारणं वक्तुमन्यः को वा वेद। देवाश्च मनुष्याश्च सृष्टेः प्रागवस्थां न तावत्प्रत्यक्षेण पश्यन्ति तदानीं स्वय (स्वेषा) मेवाऽभावात्। नाऽप्यनुमातुं शक्तास्तद्योग्ययोर्हेतुदृष्टान्तयोरभावात्। तस्मादतिगम्भीरमिदं परमार्थतत्त्वं वेदैकसमधिगम्यमित्यभिप्रायः।

अथ सप्तमीमाह—

इयं—

इयं दृश्यमाना भूतभौतिकरूपा विविधा सृष्टिर्यत उपादानकारणादाबभूव सर्वत उत्पन्ना तदुपादानकारणं यदि वा किञ्चित्स्वरूपं धृत्वाऽवतिष्ठते यदि वा तस्य स्वरूपमेव नाऽस्ति तमिमं निर्णयं यो परमेश्वरोऽस्य जगतोऽध्यक्षः स्वामी सो अङ्ग वेद यदि वा सोऽपि न वेद। ईशित्रीशितव्यादिलौकिकव्यवहारदृष्ट्या सो अङ्ग वेदेत्युक्तम्। "यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्" इत्यादिसर्वव्यवहारातीतपरमार्थदृष्ट्या यदि वा न वेदेत्युक्तम्। अतो मनुष्यादिषु तद्वेदनशङ्काऽपि दूरापेता।

'तपसस्तन्महिनाजायतैकम्' इत्यादिनाऽग्रे सृष्टिः प्रतिपादयिष्यते। अधुना ततः प्रागवस्था निरस्तसमस्तप्रपञ्चा या प्रलयावस्था सा निरूप्यते। *तदानीं* प्रलयदशायामवस्थितं तदस्य जगतो मूलकारणं तत्—*असत्* शशविषाणवन्निरूपाख्यं *नाऽऽसीत्*। न हि तादृशात् कारणादस्य सतो जगत उत्पत्तिः संभवति। तथा *नो सत्* नैव सदात्मवत् सत्त्वेन निर्वाच्य*मासीत्*। यद्यपि सदसदात्मकं प्रत्येकं विलक्षणं भवति तथाऽपि भावाभावयोः सहावस्थानमपि संभवति। कुतस्तयोः तादात्म्यमिति उभयविलक्षणमनिर्वाच्यमेवाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः। ननु नो सदिति पारमार्थिकसत्त्वस्य निषेधः। तर्ह्यात्मनोऽप्यनिर्वाच्यत्वप्रसङ्गः। अथोच्येत। न। आनीदवातमिति तस्य सत्त्वमग्रे वक्ष्यते, परिशेषान्मायाया एवाऽत्र सत्त्वं निषिध्यत इति। एवमपि तदानीमिति विशेषणानर्थक्यं व्यवहारदशायामपि तस्याः पारमार्थिकसत्त्वाभावात्। अथ व्यावहारिकसतां पृथिव्यादीनां भावानां विद्यमानत्वात् कथं नो सदिति निषेधः। तत्राऽऽह—'*नाऽऽसीद्रज*' इत्यादि। 'लोका रजांस्युच्यन्ते' (निरु० ४·१९) इति यास्कः। अत्र च सामान्यापेक्षमेकवचनम्। व्योम्नो वक्ष्यमाणत्वात्तस्याधस्तनाः पातालादयः पृथिव्यन्ता नाऽऽसन्नित्यर्थः। तथा *व्योम* अन्तरिक्षं तदपि *नो* नैवाऽऽसीत्। पर इति सकारान्तं परस्तादित्यर्थे वर्तते। परशब्दाच्छान्दसोऽस्तातेरर्थेऽसिप्रत्ययः। *परः* व्योम्नः परस्तादुपरिदेशे द्युलोकप्रभृतिसत्यलोकान्तं *यद*स्ति तदपि नाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः। अनेन चतुर्दशभुवनगर्भं ब्रह्माण्डं स्वरूपेण निषिद्धं भवति। अथ तदावरकत्वेन पुराणेषु प्रसिद्धानि यानि वियदादिभूतानि तेषामवस्थान-

प्रदेशं तदावरणनिमित्तं चाऽऽक्षेपमुखेन क्रमेण निषेधयति—'किमावरीवरि'ति। *किम्* आवरणीयं तत्त्वमावरकभूतजातम्, *आवरीवः*—अत्यन्तमावृणुयात्। आवार्याभावात् तदावरकमपि नाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः। वृणोतेर्यङ्लुगन्ताच्छान्दसे लङि तिपि रूपमेतत्। यद्वा। किमिति प्रथमैव। किं तत्त्वमावरकमावृणुयात्। आव्रियमाणवत्तदपि स्वरूपेण नाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः। आवृण्वत् तत्तत्त्वं *कुह* कुत्र देशेऽवस्थायाऽऽवृणोति। आधारभूतस्तादृशो देशोऽपि नाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः॥ किंशब्दात् सप्तम्यर्थे हप्रत्ययः। 'कु तिहोः' (पा० सू० ७.२.१०४) इति प्रकृतेः कादेशः॥ *कस्य शर्मन्* कस्य वा भोक्तुर्जीवस्य शर्मणि सुखदुःखसाक्षात्कारलक्षणे भोगे निमित्तभूते सति तदावरकं तत्त्वमावृणुयात्। जीवानामुपभोगार्था हि सृष्टिः। तस्यां हि सत्यां ब्रह्माण्डस्य भूतैरावरणं प्रलयदशायां च भोक्तारो जीवा उपाधिविलयात् प्रलीना इति कस्य कश्चिदपि भोक्ता न संभवतीत्यावरणस्य निमित्ताभावादपि तन्न घटत इत्यर्थः। एतेन भोग्यप्रपञ्चवत् भोक्तृप्रपञ्चोऽपि तदानीं नाऽऽसीदित्युक्तं भवति॥ किंशब्दादुत्तरस्य ङसः 'सावेकाचः' इति प्राप्तस्योदात्तत्वस्य 'न गोश्वन्साववर्ण' इति प्रतिषेधः। 'सुपां सुलुक्०' इति शर्मणः सप्तम्या लुक्॥ यद्यपि सावरणस्य ब्रह्माण्डस्य निषेधेन तदन्तर्गतमप्सत्त्वमपि निराकृतं तथाऽपि 'आपो वा इदमग्रे सलिलमासीत्' (तै० सं० ७.१.५.१) इति श्रुत्या कश्चिदपां सद्भावमाशङ्केत। तं प्रत्याचष्टे—अम्भः किमासीत् इति। *गहनं* दुष्प्रवेशं *गभीरं* दुरवस्थानमत्यगाधम् ईदृशमम्भः किमासीत्। तदपि नैवाऽऽसीदित्यर्थः। श्रुतिस्त्ववान्तरप्रलयविषया॥

ऋग्वेद १०-११-सू० १२९-१

ननूक्तस्य प्रतिसंहारस्य संहर्त्रपेक्षत्वात् स एव संहर्ता मृत्युर्विद्यत इत्यत आह—'न मृत्युरासीत्' इति। ननु यदि स नाऽऽसीत् तर्हि तदभावकृतम् अमृतम् अमरणं प्राणिनामवस्थानं

तदानीमपि स्यात्तत्राह—'*अमृतं न तर्हि*' इति। तर्हि तस्मिन् प्रतिहारसमये। अयं भावः—सर्वेषां प्राणिनां परिपक्वं भोगहेतुभूतं सर्वं कर्म यदोपभुक्तमासीत् तदा भोगाभावान्निष्प्रयोजनमिदं जगदिति परमेश्वरस्य मनसि संजिहीर्षा जायते। तथैव स मृत्युः सर्वं जगत् संहरत इति किमनेन मृत्युना संहर्त्रा तदभावकृतं वा कथममरणं स्यादिति। एतदेवाभिप्रेत्य कठैराम्नायते—'यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं चोभे भवत ओदनः। मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनं क इत्था वेद यत्र सः' (क० उ. २.२५) इति। नन्वेतस्य सर्वस्याऽधिकरणभूतः कालो विद्यत इत्यत आह—'न रात्र्या' इति। *रात्र्याः अह्नः* च प्रकेतः प्रज्ञानं न *आसीत्*। तद्धेतुभूतयोः सूर्याचन्द्रमसोरभावात्। एतेनाऽहोरात्रनिषेधेन तदात्मको मासर्तुसंवत्सरप्रभृतिकः सर्वः कालः प्रत्याख्यातः। कथं तर्हि नो सदासीत्तदानीमिति कालवाची प्रत्ययः। उपचारादिति ब्रूमः। यथेदानींतननिषेधस्य कालोऽवच्छेदकस्तथा मायाऽपि तदवच्छेदहेतुरित्यवच्छेदकत्वसाम्येनाऽकालेऽपि कालवाची प्रत्ययः। यदवादिष्म ब्रह्मणः परमार्थसत्त्वमग्रे वक्ष्यत इति तदिदानीं दर्शयति—'आनीदि'ति। तत् सकलवेदान्तप्रसिद्धं ब्रह्मतत्त्वम् *आनीत्* प्राणितवत्। नन्वेवं प्राणनकर्तुर्जीवभावापन्नस्यैव ब्रह्मणः सत्त्वं स्यात् न विवक्षितस्य निरुपाधिकस्य ब्रह्मणः। 'अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुद्धः' इति तस्य प्राणसंबन्धाभावात् तत्राह—आनीदवातमिति। अयमाशयः—आनीदित्यत्र धात्वर्थक्रिया तत्कर्ता तस्य च भूतकालसंबन्ध इति त्रयोऽर्थाः प्रतीयन्ते। तत्र समुदायो न विधीयते 'यथाऽऽग्नेयोऽष्टाकपाल' इति येन ब्रह्मणः सत्त्वं न स्यात्। किं तर्ह्यनेन कर्तृत्वमनूद्य भूतकालसत्तालक्षणो गुणो विधीयते 'दध्ना जुहोती'ति वाक्यान्तरविहिताग्निहोत्रानुवादेन तत्र गुणविधानम्। तत्राऽप्यनेन कर्तृत्वविशिष्टस्य न पूर्वकालसत्ता विधीयते तन्निषेधानुपपत्तिप्रसङ्गात् अतोऽनेन कर्तृत्वेन इदानींतनेनोपलक्षितं यन्निरुपाधिकं परं ब्रह्म तस्यैव

भूतकालसत्ता विधीयत इति न कश्चिद्दोष इति। नन्वीदृशस्य ब्रह्मणो मायया सह संबन्धासंभवात् सांख्याभिमता स्वतन्त्रा तद्रूपा सत्त्वरजस्तमोगुणात्मिका मूलप्रकृतिरेवाभिमतेति कथं नो सदिति निषेधः। तत्राह—'स्वधया' इति। स्वस्मिन् धीयते ध्रियत आश्रित्य वर्तत इति स्वधा माया। तया तद्ब्रह्मैकमविभागापन्न—मासीत्। 'सहयुक्तेऽप्रधाने' (पा० सू० २. ३. १९) इति तृतीया सहशब्दयोगाभावेऽपि सहार्थयोगे भवति 'वृद्धो यूना०' (पा० सू० १.२.६५) इति निपातनाल्लिङ्गात्। अत्र प्रकृति-प्रत्ययाभ्यां तस्याः स्वातन्त्र्यं निवार्यते। यद्यप्यसङ्गस्य ब्रह्मणस्तया सह सम्बन्धो न संभवति तथाऽपि तस्मिन्नविद्यया तत्स्वरूपमिव सम्बन्धोऽप्यध्य-स्यते यथा शुक्तिकायां रजतस्य। एतेन सद्रूपत्वमपि तस्याः प्रत्याख्यातम्। ननु यदि माया ब्रह्मणा सहाऽविभागापन्ना तर्हि तस्या अनिर्वाच्यत्वात् ब्रह्मणोऽपि तत्प्रसङ्ग इति कथं तस्य सत्त्वमुक्तं आनीदवातमिति। ब्रह्मणो वा सत्त्वात्तस्या अपि सत्त्वप्रसङ्ग इति कथं नो सदासीदिति सत्त्वप्रतिषेधः। नैवम्—अयुक्तिदृष्टचै-क्यावभासेऽपि युक्त्या विविच्य मायांशस्यानिर्वाच्यत्वं ब्रह्मणः सत्त्वं च प्रतिपादितम्। ननु दृग्दृश्याविति द्वावेव पदार्थौ, आनीदवातं स्वधयेति तौ चेदङ्गीक्रियेते तत्किमपरमवशिष्यते यत् नासीद्रजः इत्यादिना प्रतिषिध्येत तत्राह—'तस्मादि'ति। तस्माद्ध तस्मात् खलु पूर्वोक्तान्मायासहितात् ब्रह्मणः अन्यत् किञ्चन किमपि वस्तु भूतभौतिकात्मकं जगत् न आस न बभूव ॥ 'छन्दस्युभयथा' इति लिटः सार्वधातुकत्वादस्तेर्भूभावाभावः॥ ननु तदानीमन्यस्य सत्त्वनिषेधो न शङ्क्यः; असत्त्वे चाऽप्रसक्तत्वान्न निषेधोपयोग इत्यत आह—'परः' इति। परः परस्तात् सृष्टेरूर्ध्वं वर्तमानमिदं जगत् तदानीं न बभूवेत्यर्थः। अन्यथा उक्तरीत्या क्वचिदपि निषेधो न स्यादिति भावः॥

ऋग्वेद १०.-११.-१२९.-२

तदानीमपि स्यात्तत्राह—'अमृतं न तर्हि' इति। तर्हि तस्मिन् प्रतिहारसमये। अयं भावः—सर्वेषां प्राणिनां परिपक्वं भोगहेतुभूतं सर्वं कर्म यदोपभुक्तमासीत् तदा भोगाभावान्निष्प्रयोजनमिदं जगदिति परमेश्वरस्य मनसि संजिहीर्षा जायते। तथैव स मृत्युः सर्वं जगत् संहरत इति किमनेन मृत्युना संहर्त्रा तदभावकृतं वा कथममरणं स्यादिति। एतदेवाभिप्रेत्य कठैराम्नायते—'यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं चोभे भवत ओदनः। मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनं क इत्था वेद यत्र सः' (क० उ. २.२५) इति। नन्वेतस्य सर्वस्याऽधिकरणभूतः कालो विद्यत इत्यत आह—'न रात्र्या' इति। *रात्र्याः अह्नः* च *प्रकेतः* प्रज्ञानं *न आसीत्*। तद्धेतुभूतयोः सूर्याचन्द्रमसोरभावात्। एतेनाऽहोरात्रनिषेधेन तदात्मको मासर्तुसंवत्सरप्रभृतिकः सर्वः कालः प्रत्याख्यातः। कथं तर्हि नो सदासीत्तदानीमिति कालवाची प्रत्ययः। उपचारादिति ब्रूमः। यथेदानींतननिषेधस्य कालोऽवच्छेदकस्तथा मायाऽपि तदवच्छेदहेतुरित्यवच्छेदकत्वसाम्येनाऽकालेऽपि कालवाची प्रत्ययः। यदवादिष्म ब्रह्मणः परमार्थसत्त्वमग्रे वक्ष्यत इति तदिदानीं दर्शयति—'आनीदि'ति। *तत्* सकलवेदान्तप्रसिद्धं ब्रह्मतत्त्वम् *आनीत्* प्राणितवत्। नन्वेवं प्राणनकर्तुर्जीवभावापन्नस्यैव ब्रह्मणः सत्त्वं स्यात् न विवक्षितस्य निरुपाधिकस्य ब्रह्मणः। 'अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रः' इति तस्य प्राणसंबन्धाभावात् तत्राह—आनीदवातमिति। अयमाशयः—आनीदित्यत्र धात्वर्थक्रिया तत्कर्ता तस्य च भूतकालसंबन्ध इति त्रयोऽर्थाः प्रतीयन्ते। तत्र समुदायो न विधीयते 'यथाऽऽग्नेयोऽष्टाकपाल' इति येन ब्रह्मणः सत्त्वं न स्यात्। किं तर्ह्यनेन कर्तृत्वमनूद्य भूतकालसत्तालक्षणो गुणो विधीयते 'दध्ना जुहोती'ति वाक्यान्तरविहिताग्निहोत्रानुवादेन तत्र गुणविधानम्। तत्राऽप्यनेन कर्तृत्वविशिष्टस्य न पूर्वकालसत्ता विधीयते तन्निषेधानुपपत्तिप्रसङ्गात् अतोऽनेन कर्तृत्वेन इदानींतनेनोपलक्षितं यन्निरुपाधिकं परं ब्रह्म तस्यैव

भूतकालसत्ता विधीयत इति न कश्चिद्दोष इति। नन्वीदृशस्य ब्रह्मणो मायया सह संबन्धासंभवात् सांख्याभिमता स्वतन्त्रा तद्रूपा सत्त्वरजस्तमोगुणात्मिका मूलप्रकृतिरेवाभिमतेति कथं नो सदिति निषेधः। तत्राह—'*स्वधया*' इति। स्वस्मिन् धीयते ध्रियत आश्रित्य वर्तत इति स्वधा माया। तया तद्ब्रह्मैकमविभागापन्न—मासीत्। 'सहयुक्तेऽप्रधाने' (पा० सू० २. ३. १९) इति तृतीया सहशब्दयोगाभावेऽपि सहार्थयोगे भवति 'वृद्धो यूना०' (पा० सू० १.२.६५) इति निपातनाल्लिङ्गात्। अत्र प्रकृति-प्रत्ययाभ्यां तस्याः स्वातन्त्र्यं निवार्यते। यद्यप्यसङ्गस्य ब्रह्मणस्तया सह सम्बन्धो न संभवति तथाऽपि तस्मिन्नविद्यया तत्स्वरूपमिव सम्बन्धोऽप्यध्य-स्यते यथा शुक्तिकायां रजतस्य। एतेन सद्रूपत्वमपि तस्याः प्रत्याख्यातम्। ननु यदि माया ब्रह्मणा सहाऽविभागापन्ना तर्हि तस्या अनिर्वाच्यत्वात् ब्रह्मणोऽपि तत्प्रसङ्ग इति कथं तस्य सत्त्वमुक्तं आनीदवातमिति। ब्रह्मणो वा सत्त्वात्तस्या अपि सत्त्वप्रसङ्ग इति कथं नो सदासीदिति सत्त्वप्रतिषेधः। मैवम्—अयुक्तिदृष्टयै-क्यावभासेऽपि युक्त्या विविच्य मायांशस्यानिर्वाच्यत्वं ब्रह्मणः सत्त्वं च प्रतिपादितम्। ननु दृग्दृश्याविति द्वावेव पदार्थौ, आनीदवातं स्वधयेति तौ चेदङ्गीक्रियेते तत्किमपरमवशिष्यते यत् नासीद्रजः इत्यादिना प्रतिषिध्येत तत्राह—'तस्मादि'ति। *तस्माद्ध* तस्मात् खलु पूर्वोक्तान्मायासहितात् ब्रह्मणः *अन्यत् किञ्चन* किमपि वस्तु भूतभौतिकात्मकं जगत् *न आस* न बभूव॥ 'छन्दस्युभयथा' इति लिटः सार्वधातुकत्वादस्तेर्भूभावाभावः॥ ननु तदानीमन्यस्य सत्त्वनिषेधो न शङ्क्यः; असत्त्वे चाऽप्रसक्तत्वान्न निषेधोपयोग इत्यत आह—'परः' इति। परः परस्तात् सृष्टेरूर्ध्वं वर्तमानमिदं जगत् तदानीं न बभूवेत्यर्थः। अन्यथा उक्तरीत्या क्वचिदपि निषेधो न स्यादिति भावः॥

ऋग्वेद १०.-११.-१२९.-२

ननूक्तप्रकारेण यदि पूर्वमिदं जगन्नासीत् कथं तर्हि तस्य जन्म। जायमानस्य जनिक्रियायां कर्तृत्वेन कारकत्वात् कारकं च कारणावान्तरविशेष इति कारकस्य सतो नियतपूर्वक्षणवर्तित्वस्य अवश्यंभावात्। अथैतद्दोषपरिजिहीर्षया जनिक्रियायाः प्रागपि तद्विद्यत इत्युच्यते। कथं तस्य जन्म। अत आह—'तमसा गूळ्हमग्रे' इति। अग्रे सृष्टेः प्राक् प्रलयदशायां भूतभौतिकं सर्वं जगत् *तमसा* गूळ्हम्। यथा नैशं तमः सर्वपदार्थजातमावृणोति तद्वत्। आत्मतत्त्वस्याऽऽवरकत्वान्मायापरसंज्ञं भावरूपाज्ञानमत्र तम इत्युच्यते। तेन तमसा निगूढं संवृतं कारणभूतेन तेनाऽऽच्छादितं भवति, आच्छादकात् तस्मात्तमसो नाम-रूपाभ्यां यदाविर्भवनं तदेव तस्य जन्मेत्युच्यते। एतेन कारणावस्थायामसदेव कार्यमुत्पद्यत इत्यसद्वादिनोऽसत्कार्यवादिनो ये मन्यन्ते ते प्रत्याख्याताः। ननु कारणे तमसि तज्जगदात्मकं कार्यं विद्यते चेत् कथं नासीद्रज इत्यादिनिषेधः। तत्राह—'*तम आसीत्*' इति। तमो भावरूपाज्ञानं मूलकारणं। तद्रूपता तदात्मनाम्। यतः सर्वं जगत् प्राक् तम आसीदतो निषिध्यत इत्यर्थः। नन्वावरकत्वादावरकं तमः कर्तृ, आवार्यत्वाज्जगत्कर्म। कथं तयोः कर्मकर्त्रोस्तादात्म्यम्। तत्राह—'अप्रकेतमि'ति। *अप्रकेतम्* अप्रज्ञायमानम्। अयमर्थः। यद्यपि जगतस्तमसश्च कर्मकर्तृभावो यौक्तिको विद्यते तथाऽपि व्यवहार-दशायामिव तस्यां दशायां नाम-रूपाभ्यां विस्पष्टं न ज्ञायत इति तादात्म्यवर्णनम्। अत एव मनुना स्मर्यते—'आसीदिदं तमोभूत-मप्रज्ञातमलक्षणम्। अप्रतर्क्यमनिर्देश्यं प्रसुप्तमिव सर्वतः' (मनु १.५) इति। कुतो वा न प्रज्ञायते तत्राह—'*सलिलम्*' इति। 'षल-गतौ' औणादिक इलच्। इदं *दृश्यमानं सर्वं* जगत् सलिलं कारणेन संगतमविभागापन्नम् *आः* आसीत्। अस्तेर्लङि तिपि 'बहुलं छन्दसि' इतीडभावे 'हल्ङ्याब्भ्यः' इति तिलोपे 'तिप्यनस्तेः' (पा० सू० ८.२.७३) इति पर्युदासाद्दकाराभावः। यद्वा सलिल-

मिति लुप्तोपमम्। सलिलमिव। यथा क्षीरेणाऽविभागापन्नं नीरं दुर्विज्ञानं तथा तमसाऽविभागापन्नं जगन्न शक्यविज्ञानमित्यर्थः। ननु विविधविचित्ररूपभूयसः प्रपञ्चस्य कथमतितुच्छेन तमसा क्षीरेण नीरस्येवाऽभिभवः। तथा तमोऽपि क्षीरवद्बलवदित्येवोच्यते। तर्हि दुर्बलस्य जगतः सर्गसमयेऽपि नोद्भवसंभव इत्यत आह— 'तुच्छ्येन' इति। आसमन्ताद्भवतीति *आभु तुच्छ्येन*। छान्दसो यकारोपजनः। तुच्छेन तुच्छकल्पनेन सदसद्विलक्षणेन भाव-रूपाऽज्ञानेन *अपिहितं* छादितम् आसीत्। दधातेः कर्मणि निष्ठा। दधातेर्हि। 'गतिरनन्तरः' इति गतेः प्रकृतिस्वरत्वम्। एकम् एकीभूतं कारणेन तमसाऽविभागतां प्राप्तमपि तत्कार्यजातं तपसः स्रष्टव्यपर्यालोचनरूपस्य *महिना* माहात्म्येन अजायत उत्पन्नम्। तपसः स्रष्टव्यपर्यालोचनरूपत्वं चाऽन्यत्राम्नायते—'यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविद्यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः' (मुं० उ० १.१.९) इति।

ऋग्वेद १०–११–१२९–३

ननूक्तरीत्या यदीश्वरस्य पर्यालोचनं जगतः पुनरुत्पत्तौ कारणं तदेव किंनिबन्धनमित्यत आह—'कामस्तदग्रे' इति। *अग्रे* अस्य विकारजातस्य सृष्टेः प्रागवस्थायां परमेश्वरस्य मनसि *कामः समवर्तत* सम्यगजायत। सिसृक्षा जातेत्यर्थः। ईश्वरस्य सिसृक्षा वा किंहेतुकेत्यत आह—'मनस' इति। मनसः अन्तःकरणस्य संबन्धि वासनाशेषेण मायायां विलीनेऽन्तःकरणे समवेतम्। सामान्या-पेक्षमेकवचनम्। सर्वप्राण्यन्तःकरणेषु समवेतमित्यर्थः। एते-नाऽऽत्मनो गुणाधारत्वं प्रत्याख्यातम्। तादृशं *रेतो* भाविनः प्रपञ्चस्य बीजभूतं *प्रथमम्* अतीते कल्पे प्राणिभिः कृतं पुण्यात्मकं कर्म *यत्* यतः कारणात् सृष्टिसमये *आसीत्* अभवत्। भूष्णु वर्धिष्णवजायत परिपक्वं सत् फलोन्मुखमासीदित्यर्थः। तत्ततो हेतोः फलप्रदस्य सर्वसाक्षिणः कर्माध्यक्षस्य परमेश्वरस्य मनसि सिसृक्षा अजायतेत्यर्थः।

तस्यां च जातायां स्रष्टव्यं पर्यालोच्य ततः सर्वं जगत् सृजति । तथा चाऽऽम्नायते—'सोऽकामयत बहुस्यां प्रजायेयेति स तपोऽतप्यत स तपस्तप्त्वेदं सर्वमसृजत यदिदं किंच' (तै० आ० ८.६) इति श्रुतिः । आत्मनेत्थमवगमितेऽर्थे विद्वदनुभवमप्यनुग्राहकत्वेन प्रमाणयति—'सत' इति । *सतः* सत्त्वेन इदानीमनुभूयमानस्य सर्वस्य जगतः बन्धुं बन्धकं हेतुभूतं कल्पान्तरे प्राण्यनुष्ठितं कर्मसमूहं *कवयः* क्रान्तदर्शना अतीतानागतवर्तमानाभिज्ञा योगिनो *हृदि* हृदये निरुद्धया *मनीषा* मनीषया बुद्ध्या । 'सुपां सुलुक्०' इति तृतीयाया लुक् । *प्रतीष्य* विचार्य । 'अन्येषामपि०' इति सांहितिको दीर्घः । *असति* सद्विलक्षणेऽव्याकृते कारणे *निरविन्दन्* निष्कृष्यालभन्त । विविच्याजानन्नित्यर्थः ।

ऋग्वेद १०-११-१२९-४

एवमविद्याकामकर्माणि सृष्टेर्हेतुत्वेनोक्तानि । अधुना तेषां स्वकार्यजनने शैघ्र्यं प्रतिपाद्यते । येयं नाऽऽसदासीदित्यविद्या प्रतिपादिता यश्च कामस्तदग्रे इति कामो मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीदिति यत्कर्म *एषाम्* अविद्याकामकर्मणां वियदादिभूतजातानि सृजतां *रश्मिः* रश्मिसदृशो यथा सूर्यरश्मिः उदयानन्तरं निमेषमात्रेण युगपत् सर्वं जगत् व्याप्नोति तथा शीघ्रं सर्वत्र व्याप्नुवन् यः कार्यवर्गः *विततः* विस्तृत *आसीत्* । स्विदासीत् इति वक्ष्यमाणमन्त्राऽपि संबध्यते। 'विचार्यमाणानाम्' (पा० सू० ८.२.९७) इति प्लुतः । तत्रोदात्त इत्यनुवृत्तेः स चोदात्तः । *स्वित्* इति वितर्के । स कार्यवर्गः प्रथमतः किं *तिरश्चीनः* तिर्यगवस्थितो मध्ये स्थित आसीत् किंवा *अधः* अधस्तात् *आसीत्* । आहोस्वित् *उपरि* उपरिष्टात् किमासीत् । 'उपरि स्विदासीदिति च' (पा० सू० ८.२.१०२) इत्यनुदात्तः प्लुतः । 'आत्मन आकाशः संभूत आकाशाद्वायुर्वायोरग्निः' (तै० आ० ८.१) इत्यादिकया पञ्चमी-

श्रुत्या तत उद्गातारं ततो होतारमितिवत् क्रमप्रतिपत्तौ सत्यामपि विद्युत्प्रकाशवत् सर्गस्य शीघ्रव्यापनेन तस्य क्रमस्य दुर्लक्षणत्वादेतेषु त्रिषु स्थानेषु प्राथम्यं कुत्रेति विचार्यते। एवं नाम शीघ्रं सर्वतो दिक्षु सर्गो निष्पन्न इत्यर्थः। एतदेव विभजते। सृष्टेषु कार्येषु मध्ये केचिद्भावाः *रेतोधाः* रेतसो बीजभूतस्य कर्मणो विधातारः कर्तारो भोक्तारश्च जीवाः *आसन्* अन्ये भावाः *महिमानः*। स्वार्थिक इमनिच्। महान्तो वियदादयो भोग्याः *आसन्* एवं मायासहितः परमेश्वरः सर्वं जगत् सृष्ट्वा स्वयं चानुप्रविश्य भोक्तृ-भोग्यादिरूपेण विभागं कृतवानित्यर्थः। अयमेवाऽर्थस्तैत्तिरीयके 'तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्' (तै० आ० ८.६) इत्यारभ्य प्रतिपाद्यते। तत्र च भोक्तृ-भोग्ययोर्मध्ये *स्वधा*-अन्ननामैतत्। भोग्यप्रपञ्चः अवस्तात् अवरो निकृष्ट आसीत्। प्रयतिः प्रयतिता भोक्ता *परस्तात्* पर उत्कृष्ट आसीत्। भोग्यप्रपञ्चं भोक्तृप्रपञ्चस्य शेषभूतं कृतवानित्यर्थः। 'विभाषा परावराभ्याम्' (पा० सू० ५.३.२९) इति प्रथमार्थे अस्तातिः। 'अस्ताति च' (पा० सू० ५.३.४०) इत्यवरशब्दस्याऽवादेशः अवस्तादिति संहितायाम् ईषा अक्षादित्वात् प्रकृतिभावः।

ऋग्वेद १०-११-१२९-५

एवं भोक्तृ-भोग्यरूपेण सृष्टिः संग्रहेण प्रतिपादिता। 'एतावद्वा इदमन्नं चैवान्नादश्च सोम एवान्नमग्निरन्नादः' (श० ब्रा० १.४.२.१३) इतिवत्। अथेदानीं सा सृष्टिर्दुर्विज्ञानेति न विस्तरेणाभिहितेत्याह-'को अद्धे'ति। कः पुरुषः अद्धा पारमार्थ्येन वेद जानाति। कः वा इह अस्मिँल्लोके *प्रवोचत्* प्रब्रूयात्। *इयं* दृश्यमाना *विसृष्टिः* विविधा भूतभौतिकभोक्तृभोग्यादिरूपेण बहुप्रकारा सृष्टिः *कुतः* कस्मादुपादानकारणात्। *कुतः* कस्माच्च निमित्तकारणात् *आजाता* समन्ताज्जाता प्रादुर्भूता। एतदुभयं सम्यक् को वेद को वा

विस्तरेण वक्तुं शक्नुयादित्यर्थः। ननु देवा अजानन्तः। सर्वज्ञास्ते ज्ञास्यन्ति वक्तुं च शक्नुवन्तीत्यत आह—'अर्वागि'ति। *देवा* च *अस्य* जगतो विसर्जनेन *वियदादिभूतोत्पत्त्यनन्तरं* विविधं यद्भौतिकं सर्जनं सृष्टिस्तेन *अर्वाक्* अर्वाचीनाः कृताः। भूतसृष्टेः पश्चाज्जाता इत्यर्थः। तथाविधास्ते कथं स्वोत्पत्तेः पूर्वकालीनां सृष्टिं जानीयुः। अजानन्तो वा कथं प्रब्रूयुः। उक्तं दुर्विज्ञानत्वं निगमयति। *अथ* एवं सति देवा अपि न जानन्ति किल। तद्व्यतिरिक्तः को नाम मनुष्यादिः *वेद* तज्जागत्कारणं जानाति *यतः* कारणात् कृत्स्नं जगत् *आबभूव* अजायत॥

ऋग्वेद १०.११.१२९.६

उक्तप्रकारेण यथेदं जगत्सर्जनं दुर्विज्ञानं एवं सृष्टं तज्जगत् दुर्धरमपीत्याह—इयमिति। *यतः* उपादानभूतात् परमात्मनः *इयं विसृष्टिः* विविधा गिरिनदीसमुद्रादिरूपेण विचित्रा सृष्टिः *आबभूव* आजाता सोऽपि किल *यदि वा दधे* धारयति *यदि वा न* धारयति। एवं च को नाम अन्यो धर्तुं शक्नुयात्। यदि धारयेदीश्वर एव धारयेन्नान्य इत्यर्थः। एतेन कार्यस्य धारयितृत्वप्रतिपादनेन ब्रह्मण उपादानकारणत्वमुक्तं भवति। तथा च पारमर्षं सूत्रं—'प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्' (वे० सू० १.४.२३) इति। यद्वा। अनेनाऽर्धर्चेन पूर्वोक्तं सृष्टेर्दुर्ज्ञानत्वमेव द्रढयति। को वेदेत्यनुवर्तते। इयं विविधा सृष्टिः यत आबभूव आ समन्ताद जाययेति को वेद। न कोऽपि। नास्त्येव जगतो जन्म न कदाचिदनीदृशं जगदिति बहवो भ्रान्ता भवन्त्यपि। यतः। 'जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः' (पा० सू० १.४.३०) इत्यपादानसंज्ञायां पञ्चम्यास्तसिल्। यस्मात् परमात्मन उपादानभूतादाबभूव तं परमात्मानं को वेद। न कोऽपि। प्रकृतितः परमाणुभ्यो वा जगज्जन्मेति हि बहवो भ्रान्ताः। तथा स एवोपादानभूतः परमात्मा

स्वयमेव निमित्तभूतोऽपि सन् यदि वा दधे विदधे इदं जगत् ससर्ज यदि वा न ससर्ज। असंदिग्धे संदिग्धवचनमेतच्छास्त्राणि चेत्प्रमाणं स्युरिति यथा। स एव विदधे। तं को वेद। अजानन्तोऽपि बहवो जडात् प्रधानादकर्तृकमेवेदं जगत् स्वयमजायतेति विपरीतं प्रतिपन्ना विदधतो विधानमजानन्तोऽपि। स एव उपादानभूत इत्यपि को वेद। न कोऽपि। उपादानादन्यः तटस्थ एवेश्वरो विदधे इति हि बहवः प्रतिपन्नाः। देवा अपि यन्न जानन्ति तदर्वाचीनानामेषां तत्परिज्ञाने कैव कथेत्यर्थः। यद्येवं जगत्सृष्टिरत्यन्तदुरवबोधा न तर्हि सा प्रमाणपद्धतिमध्यास्त इत्याशङ्क्य तत्सद्भाव ईश्वरमेव प्रमाणयति 'यो अस्ये'ति। अस्य भूतभौतिकात्मकस्य जगतः *यः अध्यक्षः* ईश्वरः *परमे* उत्कृष्टे सत्यभूते *व्योमन्* व्योमन्याकाशे आकाशवन्निर्मले स्वप्रकाशे। यद्वा अवतेस्तर्पणार्थात् 'अन्येभ्योऽपि दृश्यन्ते' इति मनिन्। 'नेड्वशि कृति' इतीट्प्रतिषेधः। 'ज्वरत्वर०' इत्यादिना वकारोपधयोः ऊट्। सप्तम्या लुक्। 'न ङिसंबुद्ध्योः' इति नलोपप्रतिषेधः॥ व्योमनि विशेषेण तृप्ते। निरतिशयानन्दस्वरूपे इत्यर्थः। यद्वा। अवतिर्गत्यर्थः। व्योमनि विशेषेण गते व्याप्ते। देशकालवस्तुभिरपरिच्छिन्न इत्यर्थः। अथवा। अवतिर्ज्ञानार्थः। व्योमनि विशेषेण ज्ञातरि विशिष्टज्ञानात्मनि। ईदृशे स्वात्मनि प्रतिष्ठितः। श्रूयते हि सनत्कुमार-नारदयोः संवादे—'स भगवः कस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठित इति स्वे महिम्नि' (छां० उ० ७.२४.१) इति। ईदृशो यः परमेश्वरः *सो अङ्ग*। अङ्गेति प्रसिद्धौ। सोऽपि नाम वेद जानाति। *यदि वा न वेद* न जानाति। को नाम अन्यो जानीयात्। सर्वज्ञ ईश्वर एव तां सृष्टिं जानीयात् नान्य इत्यर्थः॥

ऋग्वेद १०.११.१२९.७

[library stamp]

ANNOTATIONS ON THE COMMENTS OF MODERN SCHOLARS

KEITH: pp. 28-31. Keith interprets this Sūkta with reference to the Golden Egg (*Hiraṇyagarbha*) in which the principle of *Tapas* becomes manifest as the primeval Purusha equal to Mind with the principle of Desire, Kāma. This is a sound interpretation and consistent with what the Indian tradition also holds. Keith also recognised in this hymn a reference to the Supreme Deity as the first cause of the World beyond the two-fold categories or Duality of *Sat* and *Asat* etc. One important fact in the comments of Keith is the distinction recognised between *Hṛidaya* and *Manas* i.e. Heart and Mind. Heart is the real divine centre unmanifest and invisible, which is the seat of *Manas* or Mind.

MACDONELL: pp. 31-35. Macdonell accepts in this hymn the evolution of *Sat* from *Asat*. He accepts Water as the substratum from which was evolved *Manas* or *Buddhi* (Intelligence) by the power of *Tapas*. Although he complains, not quite correctly, about the lack of clearness and consistency he is convinced of the fact that this is a piece of sustained speculation and the starting point of the evolutionary Sāṅkhya system. His deep insight also saw in this hymn substantial agreement with the consmogony of the

Brāhmaṇas which is the same as the *Hiraṇyagarbha-vidyā*, the Cosmic Golden Egg in which the Universal Soul is produced. He recognises the cosmogonic hymns of the Ṛigveda as the precursors not only of Indian Philosophy but also of the Purāṇas which originally concentrated on the theme of the origin of the world (*Sarga-Pratisarga*).

Macdonell's meaning of *Raśmi* as the cord joining the *Sat* with the *Asat* also is noteworthy, as found in the phrase *Sūtram vitatam*, the extended string of creation. He also recognises the distinction between *Prayati* and *Svadhā* as the contrasted male and female consmogonic principles.

WILSON: pp. 35-39. An excellent interpreation of *Sat* and *Asat* by Wilson is Matter and Spitit. The first Cause is Brahman in which the inactive matter and active spirit both existed undeveloped in their effect. The philosophy of Brahman as the transcendent cause being described in this Mantra is the view of Wilson.

COOMARASWAMY—Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy in his book '*A New Approach to the Vedas*' made a new translation of Nāsadīya Sūkta couched in an apt and precise terminology as follows :—

Rigveda, X, 129

"Non-existence (*asat*) then was not, nor Existence (*sat*); neither Firmament (*rajas*), nor Empyrean (*vyoman*) there beyond :

What covered over all (*āvarīvar*) and where, or what was *any* resting-place (*śarman*)? What were the Waters (*ambhaḥ*), Fathomless Abyss (*gahanaṁ gambram*)? I.

Then was neither death (*mṛityu*) nor life (*amṛita*), nor any fetch (*praketa*) of night or day :

That One breathed (*ānīt*) breathless (*avāta*) by intrinsic-power (*svadhā*), none other was, nor aught there-beyond. II.

In the beginning (*agre*), Dark-Inert (*tamas*) was hid (*gūḻha*) by Dark-Inert (*tamas*). This all was fluid (*salila*), indeterminate (*apraketa*) :

Void (*tucchya*) by void (*ābhu*) was overlaid (*apihita*) : That One was born (*ajāyat*) by the all-might (*mahi*) of intension (*tapas*). III.

In the beginning, Will (*kāma*) arose (*samavartat*) therein, the primal seed (*retas*) of Intellect (*manas*) that was the first :

Searching the heart (*hṛd*) thoroughly by thought (*manīṣā*) wise-singers (*kavayaḥ*) found there the kin (*bandhu*) of existent (*sat*) in the non-existent (asat). IV.

What trace was stretched across, below, and what above ?

Seed (*retas*) was, Allmight (*mahimānaḥ*) was ; Intrinsic-power (*svadhā*) below, Purpose (*prayati*) above. V.

Who knows it aright ? Who can here set it forth ? Whence was it born (*ājātā*), whence poured forth (*visṛṣṭiḥ*).

These Angles (*devāḥ*) are from its pouring-forth (*visarjana*), whence then it came-to-be (*ābabhūva*), who knows ?

Whence outpoured (*visṛṣṭiḥ*) this came to be (*ābabhūva*), or whether one appointed (*dadhe*) it or not.

He who is Over-Eye (*adhyakṣa*) thereof in uttermost Empyrean (*vyoman*), he knows indeed, or knoweth not. VII.

From his commentary which is reproduced here we learn the following facts.

(1) He Believes that the trininty of terms Tamas, Rajas and Sattva is found in this Sūkta.

(2) *Manas* was the fecundating power or Buddhi, creative intellect of Brahman.

(3) He also takes note of the principle of Prāṇa (आनीत्) that refers to the duality of Prāṇa and Apāna.

(4) His explanation of *Svadhā* as the intrinsic power generated from the first cause or primeval source is also worth noting. The primeval source is explained as the Waters, *Nirguṇa Brahman*, or Unconscious Godhead.

(5) The principle of Veil (*Āvaraṇa*) is very clearly grasped, namely that the world of Matter is a Veil for the ultimate Reality.

(6) A brilliant exposition relates to the spirit of the last two mantras in which he does not find an expression of Scepticism but by implication understands a sound ontological statement about the existence of the ultimate Reality. He is right in saying that the language of Mantras 6 and 7 could not have been used by any one who did not believe in the highest Brahman as the final essence of all cosmos existing in the highest Empyrean (*Parame vyoman*). Thus Dr. Coomaaswamy subjected the Sūkta to a more detailed and specific analysis as follows :—

That is what is called a "late" hymn: from our present point of view it suffices that it antedates the earliest Upaniṣads by some centuries. A likeness to Upaniṣadic texts generally, and to our *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.*, I, 2, I and *Maitri Up.*, V, 2, in particular will be noticed at a glance. This similarity is partly one of verbal identity (*agre, sat, asat, tamas, salila, tapas, kāma, retas, manas, hṛd, tad-eka, ānīt = prāṇiti, vāta = vāyu, avāta = nirvāta, visṛṣṭi, visarjana* etc.), partly of verbal sense (*ambhaḥ, salila = āpaḥ, tapasaḥ-mahi = tejas, svadhā = māyā, śaktī, svabhāva*), and partly of total statement. *Bandhu* (= *sajāta*) "kin" as of blood relationship, is an exceedingly well-found expression for the "opposite relation" of Existence to the Non-existent, God to Godhead, Essence to Nature ; as also in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* Up., I, 1. 2. As for *rajas*, granted that no more is here directly implied than 'firmament" or "space" and that the *Sāṁkhya* as a formulated system

is of later publication, it still remains significant that in our hymn (not to speak of other Vedic sources) we have a trinity of terms (*tamas*, *rajas*, *and tapasaḥ-mahi* = *tejas* = *sattva*) employed in their correct factorial (*gauṇa*) senses to denote the principles of passivity, movement, and essentiality, "later" represented by the three *guṇas* more explicitly, and by the corresponding Trinity of Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and Śiva. By the "primal seed of Intellect" I understand rather "intellectal virility", "creative intellect," than the *source* of Intellect : cf. Ṛg Veda I, 71. 2, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.*, I, 5, 7 and similar passages, where Intellect (*manas*) is the fecundating power that begets upon Utterance or Wisdom (*Vāc*). *Amṛta*, in the second stanza, is not "immortality," but simply life, continued existence, as in Ṛg Veda, VII, 57, 6, and equivalent to *dīrghamāyuḥ* in X, 85, 19 ; the sense is "neither birth nor death as yet were".

That "He breathes without air" (*avāta*, cf. later *nirvāṇa*, "despiration") is a profound and significant expression, implying all the correlative of motion without local movement, and the like, which may be properly enunciated of the First Principle, for (only) where there is a duality, as it were" (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka*) *Up.*, IV. 5, 15) could it be otherwise, The thought is taken up and further developed in several passages of the Upanishads, particularly the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.*, as quoted above, p. 46, *Kena Up.*, 1, 8, "Know that as Brahman which breathes (*prāṇiti*) without breath

(*na......praṇena*) yet by whom breath (*prāṇa*) is breathed (*praṇīyate*)", *Muṇḍaka Up.*, II, 1, 2, and 3, where That from which Intellect (*manas*) and Spiritus (*prāṇa*) are born (*jāyate*) is Itself imageless (*amūrtta*) un-intelligent (*amanasya*), de-spirited (*aprāṇa*), and *Taittirīya Up.*, II, 7, where That without which none might breathe (*prāṇyāt*) is self-less (*anātmya*), indiscriminate (*anirukta*), placeless (*anilayana*).

"By intrinsic power" (*svadhā*) : cf. Ṛig Veda, IV, 13, 5, "by what intrinsic power (*svadhā*) does he move ?" and the answer in I, 144,2, "When he (as Fire) dwelt diffused in the womb of the Waters (*apāmupasthe*), thence got he (*adhayat*) the intrinsic powers (*svadhāḥ*) whereby he proceeds (*īyate*)" : the waters, *nirguṇa*-Brahman, unconscious Godhead, being as explained above, the source of all omnipotence (*mahimānaḥ*) and facility (*kauśalya*). Essence being impotent (*stari*) apart from nature ; nature being power (*śakti*) and magic (*māya*), means whereby anything is done. Cf. *Bhagavad Gītā* IV, 6, "I am born by my own power," where *ātma-māyayā* is clearly the same as *Sva-dhayā*, cf. *mayayā*, in Ṛig. Veda IX, 73,5 and 9.

"That one" is clearly here not an existence, for as we have seen, his mode is modeless, in that he breathes without breath : a similar conception is met with in Ṛig Veda, I,164, 4 where That "which supports Him who is by way of being the first-born

embodiment," *prathamam jāya-mānam-asthanvantam......* *bibharti*, is itself (bodiless", or more literally, "boneless" *anasthā*, that is to say "structureless"[1]. "That is not yet "Selfed" (*ātmanvī*)—"before creatures were, God was not God, albeit he was Godhead," Eckhart, I, 410. *Tamas* (as in *Maitri Up* , V. 2.), *apraketa salila, gahanaṁ gabhīram*, etc., are all terms naturally designating the undifferentiated, unintelligible Godhead, "which is as though it were not," Eckhart, I, 381 : *asat*, non-existent, *gūḷha*, hidden, there where "darkness reigns in the unknown-known unity," Eckhart, I, 368, Cf. p. 6 and Note 21.

"What covered o'er ?" That is, what and where was the world ? *āvarīvar* being from *varī*, intensive reduplicated form of *vṛ*, "to cover," "veil." The world is thought of as veiling the ultimate reality, cf. Ṛg Veda V, 19, 1, "state after state is generated, veil (*vavri*) from veil appears," hence also the prayer, *Maitri Up.*, VI, 35, with respect to the Sun, "That face do thou unveil (*apāvṛṇu*)" or "That door do thou open."

Our hymn is by no means necessarily an expression of scepticism : it is rather wonder than a wondering that is suggested. "Who knows" is no more "sceptical" than Kabīr's *tāsuk soi santa jānai* "who are the Comprehensors thereof" or Blake's "Did he who made the lamb make thee ? "He knows or knows not," if understood to mean "he knows *and*

knows not" would be sound theology. In the last stanza, alternative theories of "emanation" and of "creation by design" are propounded. In any case, the very form of the various statements and questions proves that sound ontological speculation was by no means a new thing, for it is inconceivable that such questions had been correctly formulated just a week or year before this particular hymn was published.

Not only are the terms and implications of our hymn all formally correct (*pramiti*) they tally also in form and content with those of the Upaniṣads. Yet we are asked to believe that Vedic thought was "primitive"—that the wise-singers of the Vedic hymns were able to express themselves in terms that have been universally employed elsewhere and otherwhen with a deep and known significance, and all without knowing what it was they said. It is as though it were argued that the law of gravity had been hit upon by lucky chance, long before anyone had consciously observed that heavy objects have a tendency to fall. Surely our faith in uniformity forbids us to imagine, what is outside the range of our experience, viz., that any sound formula, any clear statement of principles, could have been propounded by anyone who did not understand his own words. It would be far easier to suppose that such a statement had been propounded in the past by those who knew what they were saying, and that it had since come to be repeated mechanically

without understanding: but on the one hand, that would be to push the beginnings of wisdom too far back for the comfort of those who fondly believe that wisdom came into the world only in their own day, and on the other would need proof by some internal evidence of the presumed misunderstanding. I prefer to believe that wherever and whenever a preposition has been correctly and intelligibly stateed (but that covers both verbal and visual symbolisms, both "scripture" and "art") the proposition was also understood. Problems of ontology are not so simple that they can be solved by "luck" or "inspiration": on the contrary there is no sort of work more arduous than "audition," and here a man has need of all the power of the pure intellect. [A New Approach to the Vedas (1933), pp. 56-59].

OUR COMMENTS ON THE OLDER EXEGETICAL MATERIAL

1. Śatapatha

The comment is short, extending to three Kaṇḍikās only but the most important that we have on this Sūkta. Its unique exposition of the principle of Mind is as follows :—

1. Mind in the beginning before creation was undefinied (*Anirukta*) and unformed (*Amūrta*).

2. Such Mind was the same as the Prajāpati himself described as *Anirukta* and *Amūrta* in the Brāhmaṇas.

This mind of Prajāpati desired to have a body (*ātmānaṃ anvaichchhat*), that is to become an Ātman have a body or to (*Ātman* = body, cf. AV., 10.2.32). This was accomplished by the power of *Tapas* or Primeval Heat (*Devaushṇya*). That single Fire was the Sun or the Universal Mind which became parcelled out into thirty-six thousand smaller fires each named an *Arka*. The number thirty-six thousand is arrived at by canputing three hundred and sixty days of the year for a period of one hundred years which is equal to a man's life. Each day or *Ahorātra* period represents the burning of one *Arka*-Fire, and each one of them is a spark from the Universal Fire that is Sūrya. Both the

Cosmic Sun and its ray in the individual centre represent the Principle of consciousness, Intelligence or Mind (*Etāvatī vai manaso vibhūtiḥ*). According to the doctrine of *Purusho vai Yajñaḥ*, it is stated that the Fires, the Soma Cups, the Altars, the Chants, and all the Rites are nothing but the symbols of Mind. The Mind is as great as Creation or Life. Again the Mind is as great as the Primeval Agni or Yajña Vedi that was the Sun.

That first cause was the same as *Manas*. This is a cardinal exposition of the Nāsadīya Sūkta in which the Principle of *Manas* or *Buddhi* is given the highest place, viz. the transendent Principle (*Anirukta* and *Amūrta*) and also the immanent catagories which evolve as the body (*Śarīra*) and the Cosmos (*Virāj* or *Aṇḍa*) or the Pañcha-bhūtas. The author of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in his pregnant remarks identifies both the transendent Brāhmaṇ beyond co-related categories and the manifested Cosmos with Mind (*Manas Tattva* or *Avyaya Purusha*) in its twofold aspects.

(2) Sāyaṇa in his Commentary on the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa:

The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa includes all the seven mantras of the Nāsadīya Sūkta (II.1.9.3-6). Sāyaṇa's comments there are different from what he has given on the Ṛigveda.

In explaining mantra 1 he takes *Sat* as *Nāmarūpa*, the world of names and forms and *Asat* as anything

absolutely non-existing like the horn on a man's head. The states beyond these two categories is called *Avyakta*. *Rajas* is said to imply the three *Guṇas Sattva, Rajas* and *Tamas*. *Vyoma* is the synonym of *Ākāśa*, taken to be the symbol of all the five material elements and the gross objects produced by them. The Brahmāṇḍa or the cosmic egg with all its sheaths like *Mahat-tattva*, *Manas* and *Pañcha-Bhūtas* did not exist. When the egg did not exist there were no sheaths to conceal it. In the case of intermediatery *Pralaya* the Waters exist, but in the case of *Mahā-Pralaya* great dissolution deep sea water did not exist.

In mantra 2 he states that there were no creatures (*Prāṇin*) and hence no life or death. The signs of Day and Night, viz. Sūrya and Chandra also did not exist. Only the Great Brahman existed by his intrinsic power which was *Māyā*, the first cause of all creation (*Sarva jagat kāraṇarūpā*). There was no movement or activity as symbolised by Vāyu or *Vāk*. Thus there was nothing higher than the one Brahman.

In the third mantra *Tamas* is translated as *Avidyā Māyā* or basic ignarance which is the cause of the world. Māyā envelopes Brahman as *Tamas* and conceals the objects. The first *Tamas* refers to a certain aspect or potency existing in Brahman by which the second *Tamas* of *Avidyā* or *Jagat* could be created. This supports the view of Sāṅkhya which believes in *Sat-kārya-vāda*. Sāyaṇa explains *Ābhu* as *Jagat* which he

says was covered in its first cause by a finitizing principle called *Tuchchha*. Basic ignorance (*Mūlā-jñāna* is called *Tuchchha* which conceals the manifest world at the time of dissolution. Sāyaṇa understand the world of *Tamas* as produced by the pre-existing *Avyakta*, *Tamas* or *Mūlā-jñāna* by the power of *Mahat* which is his translation of the word *Mahi* in mantra 3.

In mantra 4 he takes *Manas* as mind of *Parama Brahma* and *Retas* as primeval creation which is the same as *Kāma*. *Manas* is the first principle of Brahman's creation (*Brahmanaḥ Sisṛiksha-rūpam*). *Sat* is taken as the material world (*Bhūta-Bhautika-rūpa Jagat*) and *Asat* as the pre-existing *Avyakta*, *Kāma* as the link between the two (*Bandhana-hetu*).

In mantra 5 the word *Raśmi* is taken to be the individual consciousness derived from a universal source (*Svayaṁ-prakāśachaitanya*). *Tirashchīna* also is taken to be the pervasive quality of consciousness in Matter or *Chaitanya Brahma* manifesting itself through the objects, just as a thread is bound over and above a ball, similarly *Parama Brahma* encompasses from all sides the individual consciousuess. To speak of Him as above and below is not possible. *Reto-dhā* is translated as essence, the *Chaitanya* principle inside the material form. The *Mahimānaḥ* represent the material objects produced by the power of the *Chaitanya* essence. *Svadhā* is translated as *Māyā* or *Avidyā*, the lower intrinsic power of Brahman and

Prayati as Brahman or *Paramātmā* who is the substratum (*Ādhāra*). The two correspond to *Prakṛiti Puruzha*.

In verse 6 Sāyaṇa explains the expression 'Who knows,' 'Who has said', as referring to the doctrines of Kaṇāda, Gautama and Kapila and the Mādhyamic philosophers but this entails an anacronism.

Mantra 7 is explained in terms of the material cause (*Upādana- kāraṇa*) of the universe which is not known even to Brahman who is the Lord of the worlds.

(3) Sāyaṇa's Commentary in the Ṛigveda.

This is much more elaborate than what he has interpreted in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa. Althongh in substance there is not much difference, there is however a tendeney throughout to interpret the truth in conformity with the Vedānta doctrine of Śri Śaṅkarāchārya. In style also he has become polemical reflecting the spirit of his contemporaneous philosophical texts.

BOOKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

1. A Catalogue of the Brahmanical Images in Mathura Art, 1951
2. Gupta Art, 1951
3. Jaina Tirthankaras and other Miscellaneous figures in the Mathura Museum, 1952,
4. Buddha and Bodhisattva Images in Mathura Art *(out of print)*
5. Architectural Pieces in the Mathura Museum *(out of print)*
6. Uru-Jyoti—A Collection of Vedic Essays (*Hindi*), 1953
7. Bhārat ki Maulik Ekatā (*Hindi*), 1954
8. Pāṇini Kālīn Bhāratvarsha, (*Hindi*), 1955
9. Kādambarī–Eka Sāṁskriti ka Adhyayana, (*Hindi*) 1955
10. Kalā Aur Saṁskriti, (*Hindi*) 2nd. Ed., 1958
11. Veda-Vidyā—A Collection of Vedic Essays (*Hindi*), 1959
12. Pṛithivī-Putra, (*Hindi*), 2nd Ed., 1960
13. Chaturbhāṇī, being a cultural Commentary on Four Plays of the Gupta Period. *Jointly with Dr. Motichandra,* (*Hindi*), 1960

14. Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa—Ek Sāṁskritik Adhyayana, (*Hindi*), 1961
15. Kalpa-Vṛiksha (*Hindi*)—3 ed Ed.,
16. Padmāvat of Malik Mohammad Jayasi, Text with Sañjīvanī Commentary and detailed Word-Notes 2nd Ed., 1962
17. Sparks from the Vedic Fire (*English*), 1962
18. Vedic Lectures—Proceedings of the Summer School of Vedic Studies (*English*), 1963
19. Devī-Māhātmyam or the Glorification of the Great Goddess (*English*), 1963
20. Vidyāpati's Kīrtilatā—Edfted with Critical Text and Annotations and Sañjīvanī Commentary (*Hindi*), 1963
21. Studies in Indian Art—A collection of papers with Illustrations (*English*), In press
22. Heritage of Indian Art—An Album (with 250 Illustrations). *Publications Division*, Delhi. In press
23. Bhārata-Sāvitrī Vol. II (*Hindi*), In press
24. Matsya Purāṇa—A Study (*To be Issued in July 1963*) In press
25. Mathura Kalā (*Gujrat Vidya Sabhā Lectures*) Ahmadabad In press
26. Bharata-Sāvitrī Vol. I. (*Hindi*)
27. Divyāvadāna (Buddhist Sanskrit Text) Edited with Annotations, Word Notes

and Introduction (*To be issued in October 1963*) In press

28. Prāchina Bhāratīya Loka-Dharma. Meghāṇi Lectures, Rajkot (*Hindi*) In press
29. Ancient Indian Folk Cults In press
30. Chakradhvaja — A Historical Study of the Wheel-Flag of India : Text 100 pages with 100 Illustrations (*to be issued on 15 August 1963*) In press
31. An Etymological Dictionary of Hindi Language (Under preperation)
32. Arthashāstra, Vol. I with text and Five Old Commentaries In press
33. Vol. II English Commentary. Under preparation
34. Samarāṅgaṇa-Sūtradhāra, A text an Indian Architecture by Bhojadeva :
    Vol. I—Text critically edited from new Ms. material In press
    Vol. II—Commentary. Under preparation
35. Deśopadesha, Narmamālā, Kalā-Vilāsa and Samaya-Mātṛikā by Kshemendra Text, with Hindi Translation and Introduction (*Jointly with Dr. Motichandra*) In press
36. India as known to Pāṇini (Second Revised & Enlarged Edition), 1963, pp. 640
37. Indian Art. (To be published in July).

3087
22/2
State Museum, Library,